(1) Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

021850 JUN 19 2003

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

THE CITY OF BOSTON, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MICHAEL C. MCLAUGHLIN
Counsel of Record

LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL C. MCLAUGHLIN
ONE BEACON STREET
33RD FLOOR
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108
(617) 227-2275

Counsel for Petitioners

BECKER GALLAGHER LEGAL PUBLISHING, INC.,
CINCINNATI, OHIO 800-890-5001

149 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether the First Circuit erred in deciding that the Petitioners did not have Article III standing where in the absence of the use of race Petitioners would have been promoted under the provisions of Massachusetts Civil Service Law?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals can substitute its own compelling "governmental" interests for deficient compelling governmental interests of the City of Boston where the Court's substituted compelling governmental interests are events that occurred some 16 months after the use of the race in the instant case, and where the City of Boston never used said events as justifications for the use of race in the instant case, and the Petitioners never had the opportunity to challenge said events as compelling governmental interests?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals disregarded this Court's requirements under Strict Scrutiny that the Compelling Governmental Interest for the Use of race "must be clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate" when the First Circuit substituted a new standard of "plausibility", thus eliminating the need for the governmental actor to identify the multiple factors influencing its decision to use race?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals disregarded this Court's requirements concerning Strict Scrutiny by allowing the governmental actor, City of Boston, to provide various "after the fact" justifications for the use of race after the litigation in the instant case commenced, where the justifications were not articulated by the City of Boston at the time that race was used against the Petitioners, and where the justifications articulated at the time race was used against the Petitioners failed to meet Strict Scrutiny?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals erred in failing to apply this Court's standards under Strict Scrutiny in order to determine whether the use of race was narrowly tailored to achieve the alleged compelling governmental interest, where Commonwealth of Massachusetts law specifically prohibited the use of race in the promotion process for Civil Service jobs, and such prohibition was disregarded by the First Circuit in its decision that use of race did not violate state law?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals erred in disregarding the Joint Motion for Entry of Declaratory Judgment filed by Defendant Hartnett, in this official capacity of Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, admitting that the use of race in the promotion process violated Commonwealth of Massachusetts law because Hartnett allowed race to be used against the Petitioners?

Whether the First Circuit erred in holding that a mere disparity between the percentage of African American sergeants within the Boston Police Department (16.49%) compared to the percentage of African Americans within the entire Police Department of all ranks (25.02%) is "concrete evidence that discrimination existed at the time that the African American officers were promoted" where the disparity results directly from the implementation of the Consent Decree entered in *Castro v. Beecher*, 459 F. 2d. 725 (1972), and where the parties, including the United States District Court, allowed the Consent Decree to lapse after seventeen years of court involvement in the promotion process?

Whether the First Circuit Court of Appeals erred in allowing the City of Boston to suggest that the disparity between the

percentage of African American sergeants and African American officers was concrete evidence of discrimination, while at the same time, a different panel of the First Circuit Court of Appeals held in *Quinn, et al v. City of Boston*, 325 F. 3d 18 (1st Cir. 2003) operating under the exact same Consent Decree, that the discrepancy between African American firefighters and African American lieutenants was not evidence of discrimination at all?

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

The petitioners, plaintiffs below, are Winifred N. Cotter, Vincent J. Difazio, John P. Doris, William J. Dwan, William G. Knecht, Michael, Locke, Patrick L. Murphy and Thomas L. Sexton.

The defendants below are: the City of Boston and the Intervenor Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, Dennis A. White, and Harold White.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented for Review i

Parties to the proceeding iv

Table of Contents v

Table of Authorities vii

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 1

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved 1

Statement Of The Case 2

A. Facts Below 5

Reasons For Granting The Petition 11

I. The Petitioners Have Article III Standing to Obtain Damages 11

II. The First Circuit Confuses Article III Standing and Narrow Tailoring 16

III. The First Circuit Cannot Circumvent This Court's Requirements Under Strict Scrutiny by Substituting Its Own ("after the fact") Retroactively Applied Justifications for Compelling Governmental Interest 20

IV. Multiple "After the Fact" Compelling Governmental Interests Where One or More of Said Compelling Governmental Interests Fails Under Strict Scrutiny, Must Result in the Failure of All Proffered Interests 24

V. Even If This Court Were to Allow "After the Fact" Justifications for the Use of Race, the Undisputed Evidence Clearly Shows that Such Justifications Were Never Clearly Identified of Unquestionably Legitimate 27

Conclusion 28

Appendix 1a

Appendix A
First Circuit Order - 05/28/03 . . . . . 1a

Appendix B
First Circuit Judgment and Opinion - 03/25/03 . . . . 3a

Appendix C
District Court Memorandum and Order - 03/21/002 . . . . . 31a

Appendix D
District Court Partial Judgment - 01/14/02 . . . . . 99a

Appendix E
District Court Memorandum and Order - 10/20/02 . . . . . 101a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Adarand v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1995) 16, 20, 23

Boston Police Superior Officer's Federation v. City of Boston, 147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998) 5

Bush v. Vera, 116 S. Ct. 1941 (1996) 13, 20

Castro v. Beecher, 459 F. 2d. 725 (1972) ii

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) 20, 26

Cotter v. Mass. Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, 219 F. 3rd 31 (1st Cir. 2000) 9

Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980) 20, 23

MacHenry v. Civil Service Commission, 40 Mass. App. Ct. 632 (1996) 12

Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Department, 973 F.2d 18 (1992) 5

Northeastern Florida Chapter Association of General Contractors v. City of Jacksonville, 508 US 656 (1993) 15

Quinn et al v. City of Boston, 325 F. 3d. 18 (1st Cir. 2003) . . . . . iii, 5

Shaw v. Hunt, 116 S Ct. 894 (1996) 23, 26

Texas v. Lesage, 528 US 18 (1999) 11, 14, 15

West Tennessee Chap. of Assoc. Builders and Contractors, Inc. v. Bd. Of Educ. Of Memphis City Schools,
64 F.Supp.2d 714 (1999) 25, 27

Wooden v. Board of Regents of University System of Georgia,
247 F. 3d 1262 (11th Cir. 2001) 14, 15, 16

Constitutional Provision

United States Constitution, 14th Amendment 1, 19

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254 1
42 U.S.C. § 1983 . . . . . 2, 9
42 U.S.C. § 1985 2
42 U.S.C.§ 1986 2
42 U.S.C. § 1988 2
M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5,27 . . . . . passim

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the First Circuit of March 25, 2003 is attached hereto in Appendix A.

JURISDICTION

On March 25, 2003, the First Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed in part and reversed in part a decision of the District Court, dated March 21, 2002. A Petition for Rehearing En Banc was denied on May 28, 2003.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1254, this Court has jurisdiction to review judgments of courts of appeal. "Cases in the courts of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods: (1) By writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal, before or after rendition of judgment or decree."

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

This case involves portions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

> "...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

The case also involves issues under Article III of the Constitution of the United States:

"The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States..."

This case involves issues under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988.

This case involves claims under Massachusetts General Laws c. 31 §§ 1, 5, which prohibits use of race in promotion processes in Civil Service jobs.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A Consent Decree governing the hiring and promotion of Boston Police Officers was in existence from 1978 to 1995, at which time after many extensions, said Consent Decree lapsed. Approximately two years later, the Defendant City of Boston and the former Defendant James J. Hartnett, Jr., Personnel Administrator for the Human Resources Division ("HRD") for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts allowed for the promotion of three African-American officers to the position of sergeant, where said African American officers scored 84 on the promotion exam over equally scoring and higher scoring Caucasian candidates. The sole and exclusive justification for promoting the three African American officers given by the City of Boston at the time of the promotion was "to comply with EEOC Guidelines, and federal and state law". The Petitioners, all Caucasian, also scored 84, but were not considered or promoted. The City of Boston was prevented from using race by Hartnett because the Consent Decree was no longer in effect, and state law prohibited lower scoring candidates from bypassing higher scoring candidates. Ultimately, Hartnett allowed the use of race in violation of the Commonwealth's own statute, Massachusetts General Laws c. 31 §§ 1,5 which prohibited

the use of race in the promotion process. HRD permitted the promotions provided that the City of Boston promote all candidates down to and including the score 84, but excluding all white candidates at score 84. After the Petitioners filed suit against the Personnel Administrator of the Human Resources Division of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the City of Boston, Hartnett, in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator represented by the Attorney General of Massachusetts, acknowledged and admitted in a Joint Motion for Declaratory Judgment that his decision to allow race to be used so as to prevent the Petitioners from being promoted violated Massachusetts state law. Said Motion and attached Stipulation and Settlement required the Commonwealth to pay $47,188.55 to the Petitioners. This left the City of Boston and the Interveners as Defendants.

During discovery, it was determined that the use of race did not meet EEOC Guidelines (as testified to by the Defendants' own expert witness), and further, that the City of Boston at the time that it referred to "complying with state and federal laws", could not identify what state or federal law they were "complying" with, or what the terms, conditions, and requirements of the said laws were. After the commencement of the litigation, the City of Boston articulated new justifications that were never listed in any of its correspondence to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at the time of the use of race. Those justifications included diversity, "community policing," "operational needs," threat of lawsuits, and vestiges of past discrimination. The United States District Court found that the Petitioners' rights had been violated, and were likely to be violated again because of the use of race in the promotion process. However, the United States District Court found for summary judgment against the Petitioners.

The First Circuit Court of Appeals, in reversing in part and affirming in part the district court's granting of summary judgment against the Petitioners, relied on events that occurred 16 months after the use of race against the Petitioners in the promotion process, where the Petitioners never had the opportunity to challenge said events, since they were never suggested as the compelling governmental interest in the summary judgment proceeding. The First Circuit Court of Appeals further allowed the City of Boston to provide various "after the fact" justifications for the use of race against the Petitioners, where such justifications were not articulated by the City of Boston at the time that race was used against the Petitioners. The First Circuit further found that a governmental actor need not prove that all of its "after the fact" justifications meet Strict Scrutiny.

The First Circuit disregarded the Joint Motion for Declaratory Judgment in which Hartnett admitted that he had violated the Commonwealth's own statute, and further disregarded M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 which prohibits the use of race in Civil Service promotions. The First Circuit did not state its authority to disregard Hartnett's admission that he violated the Commonwealth's own statute.

The First Circuit based its decision on "narrow tailoring" under Strict Scrutiny on the fact that there was no state law preventing the use of race in the promotion process, notwithstanding the clear language of M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 preventing the use of race requires a finding, by definition, given the language of M.G.L. c. 31, that the use of race was not narrowly tailored to achieve any of the either stated justifications, or the after the fact justifications. The First Circuit also held that the mere disparity between the percentage of African American sergeants and African American police officers was "concrete evidence" of

discrimination, even though the First Circuit never acknowledged that the existing disparities in percentages between the African American sergeants and the African American police officers were as a result of the very Consent Decree that had lapsed in 1995. To the extent that the disparity exists, it is as designed by the Consent Decree which the District Court, and ultimately the Court of Appeals, had approved.

Four days after the First Circuit Court of Appeals in the instant case, it decided the case of *Quinn et al v. City of Boston*, 325 F. 3d. 18 (1st Cir. 2003) in which the Court examined the differential between minority Boston firefighters and minority Boston Fire lieutenants, under the same Consent Decree that had applied to the police in the instant case, but that continued to apply to the Boston Fire Department. A different panel of the First Circuit held that the percentage difference between minority firefighters and minority lieutenants was not evidence of discrimination at all. Thus, the determination of concrete evidence of discrimination is dependent upon, not First Circuit law, but on the luck of the draw of the First Circuit panels.

A. FACTS BELOW

In 1978, Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police (MAAAP), Intervenor MAMLEO's predecessor in interest, sued the Boston Police Department ("BPD") in district court for racial discrimination in promotion practice. In 1978, black officers made up 5.5% of the BPD as a whole yet there was only one black sergeant among 222 sergeants. *Boston Police Superior Officer's Federation v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13, 15 (1st Cir. 1998). In 1980, the parties in *Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Department* settled, and the district court entered a

Consent Decree, which included the Boston Police Department, Department of Personnel Administration, and MAMLEO's predecessor in interest, MAAAP. *Id.* The decree "set specific goals and timetables for promotions of black officers to sergeant. . . [and] These goals were to be met by the time of the decree's original expiration date of 1985." *Id.* The parties found difficulty in implementing this decree, and by the 1985 date, the Boston Police Department had not met the decree's goals. MAAAP succeeded in having the district court extend the duration of the decree until 1990. However, by 1990, the Boston Police Department had still not yet the met the goals, and BPD as Defendants to that litigation and MAAAP both requested that the decree be extended again until another validated exam could be given in 1991. Pursuant to each party's duties, MAMLEO challenged the exam, and the parties proceeded to amend the decree again as to the promotion of sergeants. *Id.* at 16.

In 1995, the parties, the district court included, allowed the consent decree to lapse by its own terms.

On October 19, 1996, an examination ("Exam") was given to Boston police officers for the purpose of determining who would be promoted to the rank of sergeant in the BPD. All of the Petitioners took the Exam.

A list of 69 candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of sergeant was generated by HRD based solely upon the 69 highest scores on the certification list. The BPD, in conjunction with the HRD, promoted officers to the rank of sergeant from that list. The highest score was 92 and the lowest score was 82. Candidates are arranged in alphabetical order in each score (thus all candidates with a score of 84 were listed in alphabetical order after all candidates who had a score of 85). In the score group of 84, 3 were African

American (the "3 African American Officers"), and 10 were Caucasian officers, 7 of whom are the Petitioners.

The BPD informed HRD that the BPD had selected the 3 African American Officers for promotion to the position of sergeant, notwithstanding the fact that they had a worse certification score than other, Caucasian, officers and exactly the same score as the Petitioners. The BPD also promoted 27 other candidates.

The BPD's sole and exclusive justification for promoting the three African American officers, at the time of the promotion, was "to comply with EEOC Guidelines and state and federal law."

The BPD stated in a letter to HRD that the selection rationale of the 3 African American Officers was based on statistical analysis conducted by the BPD which indicated that in order to avoid an "adverse impact" at least three African American officers had to be promoted. The adverse impact referred to by the BPD can only be a reference to the decrease in the percentage of sergeants below 16.17%. Thus, the BPD intended to maintain the percentage of African American sergeants at 16.17%. The failure to promote the 3 African American Officers would result in a failure to maintain the racial percentage of African American sergeants at 16.17%. Therefore, 16.17% was a quota established by the Defendants. This quota was not established as an official quota or affirmative action policy by the BPD or HRD nor was it the result of a court order.

HRD informed the BPD that the BPD's justification for the use of race was unacceptable under the provisions of Mass. Civil Service law, M.G.L. c. 31. HRD did allow the BPD to promote all candidates down to score 84, including

the three African American officers, but excluding the Caucasian candidates who also scored 84. Had the non-minority candidates with a score of 84 been promoted, the number of promotions would have been 46. Because the non-minority candidates at score 84 were excluded because of race, the class was 36. Based upon HRD's rejection of the BPD's justification for promoting the 3 African American officers, the BPD wrote a letter to the Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on June 8, 1998. The BPD specifically states:

> "In order to maintain the promotional status of the three African American officers, [the Commissioner] filed a Public Safety Civil Service Requisition for six sergeant vacancies on May 5, 1998. [The] intent was to promote the six Caucasian officers who had been initially bypassed in order to promote the three African American candidates who had scored lower on the promotional examination." (emphasis added)

This "admitted" racial goal was intended to and did exclude Petitioners for promotions because only the 3 African American Officers with a score of 84 were preselected. None of the Caucasian officers with a score of 84 were preselected or even considered. M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 specifically prohibit the use of race in promotions for Civil Service jobs. Thus, HRD violated M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5.

HRD's decision would not have violated M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 if all candidates who scored 84 were promoted. If race were not considered in compliance with c. 31 §§ 1,5 then all candidates with the score of 84 would have been promoted. The Petitioners were denied the promotions solely because they are Caucasian.

The Petitioners, on May 22, 1999, filed a suit against the City of Boston and James J. Hartnett, Jr., in his official capacity as the Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, alleging that the City of Boston and Hartnett violated the Petitioners' rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by failing to promote the Petitioners to sergeant because of their race (Harnett, as the Personnel Administrator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was responsible for oversight of the Civil Service promotion process).

After the filing of the Petitioners' Complaint, and Motion to Intervene was filed by the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, as well as two of the three African American officers who were promoted with a score of 84. The Motion to Intervene anticipated that the Interveners would act as co-Defendants, and they sought to enlarge the issues of the case by challenging the validity of the promotional exam, even though the African Americans had been promoted and the Petitioners were not challenging the exam, but only the use of race against the Petitioners. The District Court denied the intervention. However, the First Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the District Court and allowed the intervention based upon the Intevenor's suggestion that the Intervenor might challenge the fairness of the exam. *Cotter v. Mass. Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers*, 219 F. 3d. 31 (1st Cir. 2000).The Petitioners filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari seeking to overturn the First Circuit's decision to allow the intervention based upon Article III issues as well as the complexities that would result from the expansion of issues beyond what the Petitioners had claimed in the Complaint. Certiorari was denied.

After discovery proceeded and prior to summary judgment, the Petitioners and Defendant James J. Hartnett,

Jr., in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, acting through his successor and assign, Acting Personnel Administrator Patricia S. Wada, filed a Joint Motion for Entry of an Order for Declaratory Judgment and Supporting Documents, and stipulated specifically that the Commonwealth violated Massachusetts General Laws c. 31 §§ 1,5 by allowing race to be used in the promotion process, and such violation resulted in the Commonwealth failing to comport with the requirements of the statute under § 1 because basic merit principles were not applied to the promotion process. In addition, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts paid attorney's fees for the Petitioners in the amount of $47,188.55. The Order for payment of attorney's fees was entered by the United States District Court.

On summary judgment, the District Court, despite the seventeen-year presence of the Consent Decree which had lapsed only two years earlier, found that "past discrimination" was a justification for the use of race against the Petitioners. No example of past discrimination was identified by the district court or the First Circuit. However, the District Court also found that the Petitioners "face the kind of real and immediate threat of injury that anti-discrimination law is designed to redress." Opinion p.96a. The district court affirmed that the Petitioners had standing and were injured because they "obtain[ed] a score on a promotion exam identical to candidates of other races, and yet, [were] denied promotion while candidates of other races [were] promoted." *Id.* The district court further stated that this injury that the Petitioners sustained is likely to occur again, as it is likely that the Petitioners will take future promotional exams and again "participate in a competition in which they are not on an equal footing with candidates of other races." Opinion p.96a.

Despite the above findings, confirming the violation of Petitioners' rights by the City of Boston, and despite the district court's language granting Petitioners the right to "pursue equitable as well as legal relief", *id.*, the district court found Summary Judgment against the Petitioners.

On appeal to the First Circuit Court of Appeals, a three-judge panel, including Chief Judge Boudin, Senior Circuit Judge Farris of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals sitting by designation, and Circuit Judge Torruella affirmed in part and reversed in part (that portion which was reversed is not part of this Petition).

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. THE PETITIONERS HAVE ARTICLE III STANDING TO OBTAIN DAMAGES

The First Circuit inappropriately states that the Petitioners lack Article III standing, relying on this Court's decision in *Texas v. Lesage*, 528 US 18 (1999). In order to achieve its result, the First Circuit looks to the class of 30, and held that Petitioners would not have been promoted if only 30 candidates were promoted. However, the class size of 30 which was relied on by the First Circuit was an "illegal" class based upon violating M.G.L. c. 31 § 27, because, as HRD pointed out, higher scoring white candidates were being bypassed in violation of M.G.L. c. 31 § 27. HRD, therefore, prevented the City from violating § 27. Given the stated intention of BPD to promote the three African American officers under all circumstances, the class of 30 would never have been "legal." The class size of 36 is also illegal because it also violated state law under M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5, as admitted to by the State Defendant. Therefore, the class size of 36 cannot be the basis of analysis for the purpose of Article

III standing. As the district court pointed out in its decision to deny a Motion to Dismiss, Hartnett and HRD were required to

> "evaluate the qualifications of applicants for Civil Service positions in accordance with *basic merit principles* and...to administer, enforce, and comply with Civil Service law and rules. *MacHenry* 40 Mass. App. Ct. 632, 635 (1999). Among other things, the term 'basic merit principles' means (i) 'advancing...employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge, and skills...' (ii) 'assuring fair treatment of all applicants and employees in all aspects personnel administration without regard to...race [or] color...' and (iii) 'assuring that all employees are...protected from arbitrary and capricious action.'"

See Denial of Motion to Dismiss, p. 9. (In addition, basic merit principles also require that their constitutional rights as citizens be protected). Given all of the protections afforded under c. 31, HRD and the Boston Police Department could have elected to identify the three African Americans at score 84 and promote them and remained in compliance with M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5, provided that they did not use race against any other individual of equal to or higher score. This then, would have required a class size of 46 (this includes all 13 individuals, African-American and Caucasian, with the score of 84) since the intention was to absolutely promote the three African Americans. Indeed, the City of Boston freely admitted that the purpose of increasing the class size was "in order to maintain the promotional status of the three African American officers." As a result, the First Circuit's reliance on a class size of 30 or 36 is inappropriate. Under Massachusetts law, given the decision to absolutely promote the three African Americans, then the class size would have to be 46,

and in the absence of the use of race in the class of 46, the Petitioners absolutely would have been promoted. The use of race by the City of Boston excluded the Petitioners. Fundamentally, the admission and stipulation by Hartnett on behalf of HRD verifies this fact. Therefore, given the City's intention to promote the three African Americans, only the use of race excluded the Petitioners.

While this section deals with Article III standing, this Court must remain "most skeptical" of the urging of the BPD and the First Circuit in connection with the reliance on the class size of 30 or 36. *See Bush v. Vera*, 116 S. Ct. 1941, 1951-56 (1996). This is because these class sizes are being proffered for "racial justification" reasons in order to avoid liability in this case. The City of Boston, the original defendant in the Consent Decree case, fought long and hard against the plaintiffs in that case against the establishment of any "past discrimination." Now, since the political landscape has changed, the City of Boston is arguing that its own discrimination against minorities in the past justifies its use of race in the instant case. This should surely raise skepticism. Obviously, the Commonwealth believed that the City of Boston attempted implementation of the Consent Decree, even though it had lapsed when it promoted the three African Americans in the instant case. As the First Circuit pointed out, the Commonwealth informed the City that it could not justify the use of race because the Consent Decree had lapsed. Reliance on the class size of 30 or 36 is fundamentally inappropriate because the City's objective was never a specific number of promoted sergeants. Its objective was the promotion of the three African Americans officers, and it took whatever steps were necessary to achieve that goal. The City of Boston cannot have a goal of promoting the three African Americans at any cost, and then, when confronted with this case, use one of its rejected racial schemes to establish class

size. Under Massachusetts law, the class size would have to be 46. Indeed, the Defendants' expert testified that they examined a class size of 46. The establishment of the class size is race related, intended to defeat standing. All of this was explained in detail in separate memoranda filed with the United States District Court prior to its decision on summary judgment.

Even if M.G.L. c. 31 did not exist and the class size was 30, which it was not, the First Circuit's decision relies on the illogical *result-oriented* analysis of the very sort rejected by the 11th Circuit in *Wooden v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia,* 247 F. 3d. 1262 (11th Cir. 2001), suggesting that if race were not used which of course it was, then the Petitioners would not have standing because they would not have been promoted. This in effect is the denial of Article III standing based upon a hypothetical. It is axiomatic that Article III standing cannot be established by hypotheticals, nor can it be denied by hypotheticals. However, this Court's decision in *Lesage* seems to suggest that a hypothetical can result in the loss of Article III standing for damage purposes. The Eleventh Circuit considered *Lesage* in making its decision in *Wooden*. The Eleventh Circuit determined that the standard should not be whether the Appellant in that case should have received an acceptance in the absence of the use of a race-based policy. Rather, the question was whether the Appellant could have been eliminated in some race neutral first step in the admissions process that existed at the time. The First Circuit, relying on *Lesage*, pretends that there is a different process for promotion, i.e, the hypothetical process where race was not used in the illegal class of 30. The 11th Circuit in *Wooden* emphasized that the only justification for the elimination of Davis in Lesage was the application of a race-neutral step in the then existing admissions process. Under the *Wooden*

standard, a review of the instant case based upon the Massachusetts state law mandating a class of 46, it can be easily determined that there was no race-neutral criteria that eliminated the Petitioners' promotion. Certainly, the Petitioners did not score too low, since they scored 84, as did the three African Americans. The First Circuit's reliance on the class of 30 demonstrates a fundamental flaw in its logic. *Lesage* assumes that if the use of race is otherwise "unconstitutional," the plaintiff would have to show that he would have been accepted in the absence of such unconstitutional behavior. In the instant case, M.G.L. c. 31 allows for the identification and promotion of the three African Americans, provided that race is not a consideration in the granting or withholding of promotion of any Caucasian who score equal to or higher than the three African American officers. Any proposed hypothetical promotional procedure, such as the one being suggested by the First Circuit, could never resolve the problem of how this Court could ensure that Petitioners and those minorities promoted as a result of the use of race could possibly be on "equal footing," since any proposed alternative process does not alter the fact that the minorities were promoted solely because of race.

In *Northeastern Florida Chapter Association of General Contractors v. City of Jacksonville*, 508 US 656 this Court rejected the flawed, result-oriented argument, emphasizing that it was immaterial for standing purposes, because:

> The "injury in fact" in an equal protection case of this variety is the denial or equal treatment resulting from the imposition of the barrier, not the ultimate inability to obtain the benefit.

Jacksonville, 508 U.S. at 666 (*See Turner,* 396 U.S. at 362). The *Wooden* court reinforced the Supreme Court's censure of

such counterfactual hypothetical defenses, by reinforcing this Court's holding in *Jacksonville*. To ensure that there was no confusion, the *Wooden* court reiterated this Court's holding from *Adarand,* and *Jacksonville*:

> When a plaintiff competing for a government-sponsored benefit has been treated differently because of race, he has standing to challenge that differential treatment because his application has not been considered 'on equal footing' with applications from members of the favored racial group. . . focusing on the injury caused by direct *exposure* to unequal treatment, without regard to whether the plaintiff ultimately may obtain the sought-after benefit.

Wooden, 247 F.3d at 1276.

II. THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S CONFUSES ARTICLE III STANDING AND NARROW TAILORING

As evidence of the confusion of the First Circuit concerning Article III standing, this Court need only look at the discussion of the First Circuit concerning narrow tailoring. In that discussion, the First Circuit considered several factors to determine if the use of race is narrowly tailored. These factors include, (1) the extent that the beneficiaries of the use of race are specifically advantaged; (2) the extent to which the legitimate expectancies of others are frustrated or encumbered; (3) the extent to which the use of race interferes with other valid state or local policies, and; (4) the extent to which the use of race contains a built-in mechanism which will, if time and events warrant, shrink the scope and limit of the use of race's duration. *See Opinion* p. 22a. In fact, the second of these four factors for determining narrow tailoring, is in effect, an Article III standing

determination. While the First Circuit on one hand states that it need not resolve the issue of whether the Petitioners have Article III standing, it nevertheless states in determining the narrow tailoring - that the African Americans were not "specifically or unfairly advantaged by their promotions...all officers were competing for a limited number of spots. Because of this competition, the City's promotion of the African American officers did not disturb any legitimate, firmly rooted expectations of the Appellants...had the City not departed from strict rank order, no additional Caucasian officers would have been hired [sic]." *Id.* at 23a (emphasis added).

The above statement by the First Circuit, in effect, is a denial of Article III standing. However, it is undisputed that the only reason that the three African Americans were promoted over the Petitioners was solely and exclusively their race. There was absolutely no evidence that the three African American officers were more qualified or qualified differently from the Petitioners. In this regard, therefore, the Petitioners have every expectation that race not be used against them. Nor can it be denied that the three African American officers were advantaged solely because of their race. Thus, in trying to evidence narrow tailoring, the First Circuit attempts to demonstrate the lack of Article III standing, but the attempt clearly proves the exact opposite.

If that were not enough, the First Circuit inexplicably states, "No valid policies have been disturbed by hiring [sic] three African American sergeants. While Massachusetts law requires an explanation for promotions made outside of strict rank order, there is no prohibition on such out of rank decisions. See Mass. Gen. Laws c. 31 § 27."

In order to bolster its decision that Petitioners have no expectation that race won't be used against them, the First Circuit disregards the basis of Hartnett's Joint Motion for Entry of Declaratory Judgment and Stipulation admitting that he had violated M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 which specifically prohibits the use of race in any hiring or promotional procedure. It is important to note that the First Circuit unfairly stylizes its description of the Joint Motion for Entry of Declaratory Judgment against Hartnett in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator for the Commonwealth. The only reference to the Joint Motion is in footnote No. 3 of the Opinion, in which the First Circuit describes the Joint Motion as a "settlement," and that Hartnett was "dropped" from the suit. In actuality, the Petitioners required Hartnett to agree to the Entry of Declaratory Judgment against him for the express purpose of establishing certain stipulations and law contained in the Joint Motion and supporting documents, which demonstrate, in effect, that because Hartnett admitted that the law had been broken, Petitioners would be able to prove that the class size had to be 46. The First Circuit's description of the Joint Motion as a "settlement" is additionally inappropriate because the district court at the urging of the City of Boston and the Interveners, who were adamantly opposed to Hartnett's Joint Motion, refused to enter the Declaratory Judgment against Hartnett, but did enter the awarding of $47,188.55 in attorney's fees. As a result, Hartnett was never "dropped" from the litigation. The First Circuit's description of the so-called "settlement" serves the distinct purpose of avoiding the otherwise unavoidable stipulations contained in the Joint Motion. Those stipulations unequivocally admit that Massachusetts law was not complied with. Because of this, summary judgment should never have been granted against the Petitioners.

Hartnett, represented by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Attorney General's office, willingly acknowledged that its failure to enforce the provisions of c. 31 §§ 1,5 resulted in damages to the Petitioners and, as a result, the Commonwealth paid $47,180.55 in attorney's fees for the Petitioners. For whatever reason, the First Circuit has elected to disregard that Joint Motion, and to disregard the existence of c. 31 §§ 1,5 in its entirety. In this case, the First Circuit has not made any determination that M.G.L. c. 31 §§ 1,5 is somehow unconstitutional, nor could it, since it is consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Specifically, c. 31 "requires that the Personnel Administrator evaluate the qualifications of applicants for Civil Service positions in accordance with basic merit principles..." As the Joint Motion from the Hartnett states,

> "Among other things, the term 'basic merit principles means (i) advancing...employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge, and skills...; (ii) 'assuring fair treatment of all applicants and employees in ll aspects of personnel administration without regard to...race [or] color...'; and (iii) assuring that all employees are...protected from arbitrary and capricious action. M.G.L. c. 31 § 1...nonetheless knowing of the Boston Police Department's intent to promote the Three Black Officers solely on the basis of their race and scores, HRD (the Commonwealth) should have required the Boston Police to adequately justify the eventual promotion of the Three Black Officers to the exclusion of the equally scoring Plaintiffs, and by not doing so, HRD did not comport with basic merit principles."

The First Circuit simply disregards the existence of the State law prohibiting the use of race. It does so in order to bolster its already fractured reasoning that the Petitioners have no Article III standing because they have no reasonable expectation that race will be not be used against them. In any event, if the First Circuit is confused about the issues related to Article III standing in this regard, it is unmistakably clear that the use of its justifications for narrow tailoring must necessarily fail, since the First Circuit most certainly was aware that there was a valid public policy under state law which prohibited the use of race, and the State has admitted its liability in this regard. For this reason alone, this Court should grant Certiorari.

III. THE FIRST CIRCUIT CANNOT CIRCUMVENT THIS COURT'S REQUIREMENTS UNDER STRICT SCRUTINY BY SUBSTITUTING ITS OWN (AFTER THE FACT) AND RETROACTIVELY APPLIED JUSTIFICATIONS FOR COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTERESTS

This Court requires that Strict Scrutiny be applied to any governmental actor's use of racial classifications. *See Adarand v. Pena*, 515 U.S. 200 (1995). Strict scrutiny in turn requires a compelling governmental interest and narrow tailoring towards that interest. *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469, 505, 507-508 (1989). This Court has also stated that courts must be the "most skeptical" of the use of race by any governmental actor. *See Bush v. Vera*, 116 S.Ct. 1941, 1951-56 (1996). Racial classifications are simply too pernicious to permit anything but the "most exact connection between the justification and the classification". *Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 213, quoting Stevens, J. dissenting in *Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 448 U.S. 448 (1980) (emphasis supplied).

The stated justification at the time of the use of race against the Petitioners was contained in a December 26, 1997 letter from the Director of Human Resources for the Boston Police Department to the Assistant Director of the Human Resources Division of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. That justification was "to ensure compliance with current EEOC Guidelines and applicable federal and state discrimination laws." No other justifications were ever provided prior to the filing of the litigation. After the litigation was filed, the City of Boston raised ex post facto defenses, including "community policing," the threat of litigation, "operational needs," "diversity of the police force," and past discrimination. At no time was there any suggestion by the City of Boston that events that would take place seventeen months after the use of race against the Petitioners would be used as a justification for said use of race. During discovery, the City testified that it was unaware of any federal or state law which actually required the use of race. The City also testified that it was unaware of any discrimination against minorities by the Department, since the Consent Decree lapsed. It was unaware of any claims by the three African Americans who were promoted. It was unaware of any threats of litigation in connection with the exam in question. Thus the only remaining possible justification would have to be limited to EEOC Guidelines. However, the Defendants' own expert, Lundquist, testified at the Daubert Hearing that even with the use of race in the instant case the City of Boston did not achieve EEOC Guidelines at all. So the use of race could not have ensured compliance with EEOC Guidelines. Thus, the "clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate goal", to the extent that adverse impact is such a goal, was admittedly not met, and therefore not narrowly tailored. Rather than discussing this failure, the First Circuit chose to disregard it. Without "compliance with EEOC Guidelines," and without identified

"state and federal law," the stated justifications could never be "clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate," as this Court requires. With the "legitimacy" of the proffered justification in shambles, the First Circuit, on its own, relied on an event which occurred seventeen months after the use of race against the Petitioners, in which a Police Department employee hung a noose over an African American officer's motorcycle. The First Circuit stated,

> "Commissioner Evans, who made the decision to promote the African American officers, was aware of racial tensions within the Department. Officers had complained to him about disparate treatment, including racially based punishment and job assignment. Officers also complained to him that they were racially targeted following an incident where a noose was placed on an officer's motorcycle."

See Opinion, First Circuit Court of Appeals, p. 21a.

This is the "noose" incident, which in reality took place over a year after the use of race in the instant case. This fact was pointed out to the First Circuit by the Petitioners in the Petition for Rehearing En Banc, in which it was suggested that if it were a factual mistake, it should be corrected. In the alternative, Petitioners pointed out that if a retroactive justification were being applied by the First Circuit, such a justification was unconstitutional. The First Circuit refused to change its ruling. The First Circuit's substituted compelling governmental interests of "racial tensions" is not "clearly identified or unquestionably legitimate," since it is not the governmental actor making that determination at the time race was used. It is a decision of a court substituting its compelling governmental interest 17 months after the fact. Nor is there any suggestion that the promotion of the three African

American officers over the Petitioners was narrowly tailored to eliminate the First Circuit's compelling governmental interest of "racial tensions." In any event, the decision to rely on after the fact justifications of the "noose incident" is equally defective, since that incident had nothing to do with rectifying governmental action against African Americans. The reference in the above quote to minorities complaining of disparate treatment resulted from a study undertaken by the Department and released approximately in January of 2001, over three years after the use of race against the Petitioners.

This Court has rejected the idea of governments providing retroactive justification for the use of race. Given the fact that the First Circuit is supplying a retroactive justification, it must certainly violate Strict Scrutiny. In *Shaw v. Hunt*, 116 S.Ct. 894 (1996)(Shaw II) the Appellees attempted to prove that their use of race could be justified based on two reports prepared for the litigation challenging the use of race. This Court found that the reports were not in existence at the time that racial classification was used and as such could not have been the basis of justifying the use of race retroactively. *See Shaw v. Hunt,* 116 S.Ct. 894, 1903 (1996).

This Court's *Shaw II* decision on the prohibition against retroactivity is strengthened when viewed in conjunction with *Adarand* when this Court held that there must be the "most exact connection between the justification and the classification." *Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 213, quoting Stevens, J. dissenting in *Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 448 U.S. 448 (1980). This holding must presume, based upon the "most exact connection" standard, that the governmental actors identified and fully understood why the classification was made at the time it was made. Any retroactive analysis by a court to supply the governmental actor with a retroactive justification for the classification, by definition, would not be the "most

exact connection." This exact connection is a mandatory requirement in order for the governmental actor (not the court) to achieve the second prong of Strict Scrutiny, i.e. narrow tailoring. The need to retroactively identify an interest means that narrow tailoring could never have been achieved, since it would be impossible for the governmental actor to narrowly tailor a use of race to achieve a goal of the court and never proffered by the governmental actor, resulting from an event which had not yet occurred at the time that race was used against the Petitioners.

IV. MULTIPLE "AFTER THE FACT" COMPELLING GOVERNMENTAL INTERESTS, WHERE ONE OR MORE OF SAID INTERESTS FAILS, MUST RESULT IN THE FAILURE OF ALL PROFFERED INTERESTS

The City proffered multiple justifications for the use of race. By proffering these so-called compelling governmental interests, the City has put itself in a constitutionally indefensible position. This is because the compelling governmental interest must be "clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate" and because there must be "the most exact connection between the justification and the classification." The First Circuit stated, while acknowledging each proffered reason must satisfy Strict Scrutiny, "Whether each proffered reason satisfies Strict Scrutiny is a question of law or a question of how the law applies to the facts..." *See First Circuit Opinion* p. 16a. Having said that, the First Circuit then relies on a "plausibility" argument as to whether or not there is <u>any need to identify</u> the justification for the classification by race. Thus, the First Circuit simply disregards the failure of the City of Boston to identify the various justifications at the time that race was used. "It is <u>plausible</u> that the Department did not feel the need to identify

[to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts] the multiple factors influencing its decision [to use race against the Petitioners]. If any of the justifications is a compelling state interest, and the City's actions were narrowly tailored to that end, the City's actions are constitutional." *See First Circuit Opinion* pp. 16-17a.(emphasis supplied). "Plausibility" is not the "most exact connection." Plausibility is most certainly not "clearly defined." Indeed, the decision of the First Circuit to rely on "plausibility" requires that the court is disregarding its obligation to be "most skeptical" in review of such justifications, and that each justification be clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate. The First Circuit, in effect, is agreeing that the governmental actor need not feel the need to identify its compelling governmental interests at the time it uses race. The "plausibility" standard has no place within the Strict Scrutiny paradigm. This Court has determined the critical importance of clearly identified justification. The fact that the City of Boston "did not feel the need" to comply with Strict Scrutiny is dispositive. The First Circuit then, without cite to any case, dismisses the argument that a failure of one or more multiple justifications would by definition mean that there is something less than the most exact connection between the classification and the justification.

The constitutional problems caused by "after the fact" justifications are exactly the same as those caused by post-enactment evidence. This problem was analyzed extensively by the United States District Court in *West Tennessee Chap. of Assoc. Builders and Contractors, Inc. v. Bd. Of Educ. Of Memphis City Schools*, 64 F.Supp.2d 714, which said:

> "With all due respect to these various circuit courts that have addressed this issue, the court concludes that admitting post-enactment evidence to show a compelling interest is contrary to Supreme Court

precedent, as developed in Wygant, Croson and Shaw. The court holds, therefore, that post-enactment evidence may not be used to demonstrate that the government's interest in remedying prior discrimination was compelling...Because motive is an issue, it also makes sense to require that the governmental entity establish a strong basis in evidence before acting, rather than allowing a lesser standard...where a governmental entity establishes a strong basis in evidence of the need for remedial action prior to enacting a racially-based program, the court can fairly infer that the actual purpose of the program is remedial. On the other hand, if a governmental body implements a racial preference plan with little or no evidence of the need for such a program, the court can only speculate on the government's motive. Such speculation is insufficient to survive strict scrutiny analysis. *See Shaw*, 517 U.S. at 908 n. 4, 116 S.Ct. 894...Additionally, allowing the use of post-enactment evidence may encourage a government with strong racial political motivations to enact race-based preferences without an adequate factual basis. If sued, the government can then marshal its resources and use the subpoena power of the courts to support its program. This prospect may create a chilling-effect that discourage non-minorities for protecting their rights. A non-minority contractor, for instance, might feel that its equal protection rights have been violated by an affirmative action plan adopted without proper evidence of its need. However, the contractor may hesitate to sue, knowing that if it does, the public defendant will conduct extensive additional research through the legal process in an attempt to support the plan. In essence, the plaintiff would be forced to attack a moving target

> of newly developing evidence to support past motivations, rather than to deal with the motivating factors that existed at the time of the government's action.

Western Tennessee, 64 F.Supp.2d 714,719-720

V. EVEN IF THIS COURT WERE TO ALLOW "AFTER THE FACT" JUSTIFICATIONS, THE UNDISPUTED EVIDENCE CLEARLY SHOWS THAT SUCH JUSTIFICATIONS WERE NEVER CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AND UNQUESTIONABLY LEGITIMATE

In his Deposition, Boston Police Commissioner Evans was asked whether "diversity," a stated defense, was a goal for using race. He answered that he "probably" believed that, but the major reason was the adverse impact. He describes adverse impact as the major reason four times. This testimony proves that the Commissioner had not clearly identified an unquestionably legitimate goal before promoting the three African American officers, as he states that he "probably" or "may have" believed in a "secondary" issue of diversity.

Various proffered "after the fact" compelling governmental interests cannot be argued by the City "in the alternative" since each "interest" would have to be based upon difficult and different factual considerations and justifications used in the process of narrow tailoring the use of race. For example, if "ensuring compliance" with EEOC Guidelines was "the" reason, then the City would have to show that the use of race against the Petitioners was narrowly tailored to achieve that goal. It was not because EEOC Guidelines were not met. In addition, what percentage of the

total justification did compliance with EEOC Guidelines actually represent? If the Court is to be at its most skeptical, then it must require this to be answered in order to discourage what has occurred in this case, i.e., the wholesale substitution of every conceivable justification in hope that the Court will "buy" one. If compliance with state and federal law was the compelling governmental interest, then the City would have to show how the exclusion of the Petitioners achieved compliance with such laws. However, the City never identified any state or federal law in the first place, so how can the governmental actor narrowly tailor to some unknown law? The same questions must be asked about each of the "after the fact" justifications. Since each justification, added together, would have to represent 100% of the justification, then failure of one would mean that the "most exact connection" was not possible. This is as it should be in order to ensure that the governmental actor meets the difficult standard of Strict Scrutiny. To allow the "smorgasbord" of "after the fact" justifications without adherence to the "most exact connection," renders Strict Scrutiny a nullity. Moreover, 100% of the so-called expert testimony proffered by the City of Boston failed every conceivable standing set out by this Court in *Daubert*. Thus, narrow tailoring for these multiple justifications would have to have miraculously been exactly the same. It is impossible that the exclusion of the Petitioners or the promotion of the three African American officers would have achieved these goals.

CONCLUSION

The First Circuit's decision raises important deviations from this Court's holdings on Article III standing and the requirements of Strict Scrutiny. It also represents confusion on the part of the First Circuit as to what are acceptable "compelling governmental interests" and narrow tailoring.

The Petitioners respectfully request that Certiorari be granted in order to determine if this case should be reversed and/or remanded.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael C. McLaughlin
Counsel of Record
One Beacon Street, 33rd Floor
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 227-2275

Attorney for Petitioners
Winifred N. Cotter, Vincent J. Difazio, John P. Doris, William J. Dwan, William G. Knecht, Patrick L. Murphy, and Thomas L. Sexton.

Date: June 19, 2003

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

[Entered May 28, 2003]

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL., Plaintiffs, Appellants,	)	
v.	)	No. 02-1404
CITY OF BOSTON, ET AL., Defendants, Appellees.	)	
WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL., Plaintiffs, Appellees,	)	
v.	)	No. 02-1458
CITY OF BOSTON, ET AL., Defendants, Appellant.	)	
WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL., Plaintiffs, Appellees,	)	
v.	)	No. 02-1459
DENNIS A. WHITE, ET AL., Defendants, Appellants.	)	

JUDGES: Before Chief Judge Boudiin, Senior Judge Farris, Judge Torruella, Judge Selya, Judge Lynch, Judge Lipez, Judge Howard.

ORDER OF COURT

Upon consideration of appellant's petition for rehearing En Banc,

It is hereby ordered that said petition be denied, as untimely.

By the Court:

/s/ _____
Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk

[cc: Ms. Cohen, Jones, Rutkowski, Messrs. McLaughlin, Albano, Fitzpatrick, Glass, Hoch]

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

Nos. 02-1404, 02-1458, 02-1459

[Entered March 25, 2003]

WINIFRED COTTER, ET AL.,	)
Appellants/Cross-Appellees,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
THE CITY OF BOSTON; DENNIS A. WHITE;	)
HAROLD WHITE; MASSACHUSETTS	)
ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW	)
ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS,	)
Appellees/Cross-Appellants,	)
	)
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,	)
Executive Office for Administration and	)
Finance Human Resources Division, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)
	)

JUDGMENT

This cause came on to be heard on appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

Upon consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows: The district court's decision that the City's actions did not violate the appellants' constitutional rights is affirmed. The district court's retention of jurisdiction is reversed.

By The Court:

/s/ _____
Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk

Certified and Issued
as mandate under
Fed. R. App. P. 41
/s/ _____
Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk
/s/ _____
Deputy Clerk

[cc: Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. FitzPatrick and
Ms. Rutkowski.]

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

Nos. 02-1404, 02-1458, 02-1459

[Entered March 25, 2003]

WINIFRED COTTER, ET AL.,	)
Appellants/Cross-Appellees,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
THE CITY OF BOSTON; DENNIS A. WHITE;	)
HAROLD WHITE; MASSACHUSETTS	)
ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW	)
ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS,	)
Appellees/Cross-Appellants,	)
	)
COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,	)
Executive Office for Administration and	)
Finance Human Resources Division, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)
	)

APPEALS FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
Hon. William G. Young, U.S. District Judge

JUDGES:
Before Boudin, Chief Judge, Farris,* Senior Circuit Judge, and Torruella, Circuit Judge.

---

* Of the Ninth Circuit, sitting by designation.

OPINION

TORRUELLA, Circuit Judge. Plaintiffs-appellants, seven Caucasian officers of the Boston Police Department ("BPD" or the "Department"),[1] allege that their constitutional rights to equal protection were violated when the Department promoted three African-American police officers to sergeant instead of the appellants, who had the same ranking on the list of officers eligible for promotion.[2] The district court found that the race- conscious action of the City was narrowly tailored to the compelling state interests of remedying past discrimination and avoiding litigation, and therefore, passed strict scrutiny. *Cotter v. City of Boston*, 193 F. Supp. 2d 323, 357 (D. Mass. 2002). The district court also retained jurisdiction to consider future racially motivated decisions by the Department. *Id.* at 356-57. Appellants appeal the district court's decision, and the City cross-appeals on the issues of standing and retained jurisdiction. First, we find that appellants have standing to seek immediate promotion only.

---

[1] The officers are Winifred N. Cotter, Vincent J. DiFazio, John P. Doris, William J. Dwan, William G. Knecht, Patrick L. Murphy, and Thomas L. Sexton.

[2] Plaintiffs originally filed suit against the City of Boston and James J. Hartnett, Jr., in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Human Resources Division. Hartnett settled with plaintiffs and was dropped from the suit. We permitted the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers ("MAMLEO"), and Dennis A. White and Harold White, two of the African-American officers who were promoted to sergeant, to intervene as defendants. *Cotter v. Mass. Ass'n of Minority Law Enforcement Officers*, 219 F.3d 31, 37 (1st Cir. 2000). Except where their interests diverge, we refer to all defendants-appellees collectively as the "City."

Next, we affirm the district court's decision that the City's action was constitutional, finding that the City has demonstrated the compelling state interest of remedying past discrimination. Finally, we reverse the district court's retention of jurisdiction.

I. Background

A. Facts

In December, 1997, the BPD sought to promote thirty police officers to sergeant. A score was computed for each candidate who took a 1996 sergeant promotion examination given by the Human Resources Division ("HRD"). The score was based on a state examination, a Boston examination, education, and training. Following standard hiring procedure, the Department obtained a list ranking the top sixty-nine performers.

If promotions had been made in strict rank order, twenty-nine non-African-American officers and one African-American officer would have been promoted, all of whom had a score of eighty-five or higher. The Department determined that this promotional decision would violate the "four-fifths rule" in the EEOC's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, indicating possible adverse impact on minority candidates.[3] *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D) (2003).

---

[3] The four-fifths rule provides that

> [a] selection rate for any race . . . which is less than four-fifths (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be

Such adverse impact may signify that the testing or past hiring was discriminatory. For this reason, and others that we will discuss below, the BPD sought greater African-American representation among sergeants. Therefore, the Department promoted the top twenty-six officers in strict rank order; this included all officers scoring eighty-six and above, with the exception of one officer who was bypassed for cause. Seven non-African-American officers had scored eighty-five; two of them were promoted. Finally, the Department promoted the three African-American officers who had scored 84 (the "African-American Officers"), while choosing not to promote ten Caucasion officers who also scored eighty-four.

Because it had elected to promote officers scoring eighty-four before officers scoring eighty-five, the BPD was required by Massachusetts law to provide a statement to the HRD explaining the reasons for its departure from strict rank order.

> regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.

29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D). Had the BPD promoted in strict rank order, the selection rate for African-Americans would have been three percent (one African-American officer selected out of thirty-three who passed the examination) and the selection rate for non-African-Americans would have been fifteen percent (twenty-nine promoted out of 192 who passed the examination), for a selection ratio of twenty percent (three percent divided by fifteen percent). This result is well below the eighty percent guideline established by the EEOC.

See Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27 (2002). The BPD sent a letter to the HRD stating that the departure from strict rank order to promote the African-American Officers was done to "ensure compliance with current EEOC guidelines, and applicable federal and state discrimination laws." The HRD rejected this explanation, contending that the BPD was erroneously acting under a terminated consent decree.[4]

In response to the HRD's rejection, the Department promoted six additional officers (one formerly bypassed for cause and five with a score of eighty-five). Thus, the end result was that all thirty-three officers scoring eighty-five and higher were promoted, the three African-American Officers scoring eighty-four were promoted, and ten non-African-American officers scoring eighty-four, including the seven Caucasian plaintiffs, were not promoted. Of the thirty-six officers promoted to sergeant, four were African-American and thirty-two were not African-American.

B. History of the Case

On May 21, 1999, plaintiffs filed suit against the City alleging that the Department violated plaintiffs' civil rights under 42 U.S.C § 1983 (2003) by failing to promote plaintiffs to sergeant because of their race.

After full discovery, the City moved for summary judgment, alleging that the plaintiffs lacked standing, and that the promotions of the African-American Officers were a

---

[4] A consent decree governing sergeant promotions at the BPD was allowed to lapse in 1995.

narrowly-tailored means of meeting several compelling governmental interests. Specifically, the City claimed that the promotions furthered compelling governmental interests by (a) remedying past discrimination in the Department's promotions of minority officers to sergeant; (b) avoiding the reasonable likelihood of Title VII litigation if the Department made strict rank order promotions; and (c) meeting the Department's operational needs.

On March 22, 2002, the district court dismissed plaintiffs' claims and entered judgment in favor of the City. The district court found that the City's actions were a narrowly-tailored means of remedying the continuing effects of past discrimination and avoiding litigation. *See Cotter*, 193 F. Supp. 2d at 350. The district court retained jurisdiction post-judgment to oversee all of the Department's future hiring and promotional decisions involving race. *Id.* at 356-57. This appeal and cross-appeal timely followed.

II. Discussion

Summary judgment is appropriate upon a showing "that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) (2003). We review the district court's entry of summary judgment de novo, in the light most favorable to the losing party. *Houlton Citizens' Coalition v. Town of Houlton*, 175 F.3d 178, 184 (1st Cir. 1999). We may affirm the district court's decision on "any independent ground that is apparent in the record." *United States v. Puerto Rico*, 287 F.3d 212, 218 (1st Cir. 2002).

A. Standing

Article III of the Constitution confines the federal courts to deciding actual cases or controversies. *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 750, 82 L. Ed. 2d 556, 104 S. Ct. 3315 (1984). Inherent in this limitation is the notion that "federal courts may exercise power only as a last resort, and as a necessity, and only when adjudication is consistent with a system of separated powers and the dispute is one traditionally thought to be capable of resolution through the judicial process." *Id.* at 752 (internal quotations and citations omitted). The most important Article III doctrine is that of standing, which ensures that plaintiffs have alleged a personal stake in the outcome of the controversy. Requiring a plaintiff to have standing sharpens the presentation of issues and illuminates difficult constitutional questions. *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 204, 7 L. Ed. 2d 663, 82 S. Ct. 691 (1962).

At an irreducible constitutional minimum, a party attempting to invoke federal jurisdiction must establish that (1) he has suffered an injury in fact, (2) the injury was caused by the challenged action of the defendant, and (3) a favorable ruling would likely redress his injury. *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61, 119 L. Ed. 2d 351, 112 S. Ct. 2130 (1992). The standing inquiry requires careful judicial examination of a complaint's allegations to ascertain whether the particular plaintiff is entitled to an adjudication of the particular claims asserted. *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. at 752. We review the district court's standing decision de novo. *Donahue v. City of Boston*, 304 F.3d 110, 116 (1st Cir. 2002).

The plaintiffs sue under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, seeking damages, immediate promotion, and an order prohibiting the Department from considering race in future promotions. Since a plaintiff must establish standing for each type of relief sought, *id.* at 116, we consider appellants' standing to seek damages and injunctive relief separately.[5]

The appellants first argue that they have standing to obtain damages. Prior precedent bars this effort. In *Texas v. Lesage*, 528 U.S. 18, 145 L. Ed. 2d 347, 120 S. Ct. 467 (1999), the Supreme Court held that "where a plaintiff challenges a discrete governmental decision as being based on an impermissible criterion and it is undisputed that the government would have made the same decision regardless, there is no cognizable injury warranting relief under § 1983." *Id.* at 21. It is uncontested that had the Department not used race-conscious criteria, it would have only promoted candidates with a score of eighty-five or higher. Because appellants only scored eighty-four, they cannot show standing for damages.

Lesage could be distinguished on the ground that the plaintiff in that case received a lower score than all of the applicants who were admitted to the university program at issue there. By contrast, the appellants here earned the same score as the African-American Officers. However, this court in *Donahue v. City of Boston*, 304 F.3d at 114, read *Lesage* to encompass a situation similar to this one. In *Donahue*, the

---

[5] The district court decision preceded our decision in *Donahue*, and the court found that plaintiffs had standing to pursue damages and injunctive relief. *Cotter*, 193 F. Supp. 2d at 337.

plaintiff police candidate had received a higher score on the relevant exam than did a minority officer who was hired. We applied *Lesage*, noting that the plaintiff had no chance of being hired regardless of the Department's affirmative action program. *Id.* at 119. This interpretation of *Lesage* controls here as law of the circuit. Several of our sister circuits have also found that plaintiffs lack standing to sue for damages if they cannot show that they would have benefitted had the government not considered race. *See Aiken v. Hackett*, 281 F.3d 516 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied sub nom. Ashton v. City of Memphis*, 154 L. Ed. 2d 23, 2002 U.S. LEXIS 5550, 123 S. Ct. 87 (Oct. 7, 2002); *McNamara v. City of Chicago*, 138 F.3d 1219, 1221 (7th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 981, 142 L. Ed. 2d 398, 119 S. Ct. 444 (1998) ("A plaintiff who would have been no better off had the defendant refrained from the unlawful acts of which the plaintiff is complaining does not have standing under Article III of the Constitution to challenge those acts in a suit in federal court."); *Grahek v. City of St. Paul*, 84 F.3d 296, 298 (8th Cir. 1996) (finding Caucasian male candidates for police officer positions lacked standing because they could not show that they would have been promoted, even if the police department had not made use of a list of "protected class applicants").

Appellants next argue that they have standing to seek immediate promotion. While one could imagine that this issue could similarly be resolved against the appellants under *Donahue* and *Lesage*, neither of those cases addressed standing for this type of immediate injunctive relief. Instead, both of those cases focused only on standing to seek an injunction to prevent future violations. Thus, neither of those cases, nor any other binding precedent, mandates a certain result here.

Two of the appellants have been promoted to sergeant since this lawsuit was filed, and therefore lack standing to seek immediate promotion. We think that the remaining appellants have made a colorable claim of standing to seek immediate promotion. The Department has promoted African-American officers who obtained the same score as the appellants and there is no indication that the Department would consider demoting the promoted African-American Officers. If we assume *arguendo* that the Equal Protection Clause prohibits racial discrimination on these facts and permits the injunctive relief sought by the appellants, then it is sufficiently clear that the appellants would have suffered a cognizable injury for standing purposes.

There is a different form of injunctive relief not explicitly mentioned in the plaintiffs' complaint but arguably embraced by their briefs, namely, that if unlawful discrimination occurred in this case, such discrimination should be barred in future promotion contests involving these plaintiffs. A plaintiff challenging an ongoing race-conscious program satisfies the injury requirement if he shows (1) a likelihood that he will compete for the governmental benefit in question in the future, and (2) that he will be prevented from competing on equal footing because of the government's discriminatory practice. *Donahue*, 304 F.3d at 119; *accord N.E. Fla. Chapter of the Associated Gen. Contractors v. City of Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. 656, 666, 124 L. Ed. 2d 586, 113 S. Ct. 2297 (1993). The difficulty here is that the circumstances are so peculiar that it is at least debatable whether a likelihood of recurrence is sufficient to justify standing on a future repetition theory. *See, e.g., Yeager v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 265 F.3d 389, 395 (6th Cir. 2001) (finding plaintiff's possible future injury too speculative to

grant him standing). Since on the merits we find that there was no unlawful discrimination, the question of whether there would be standing for this form of relief need not be resolved here.

B. Affirmative Actions and Strict Scrutiny

There is rich public debate about the issue of affirmative action. Some argue it is racial discrimination and is inconsistent with a color-blind constitution, while others believe that it is necessary to put long-oppressed groups on equal footing with the majority. Our job is not to endorse one view over the other, but to simply evaluate the constitutionality of any racially-motivated governmental program.

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment provides, in part, that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." U.S. Const. amend. XIV. The Clause does not mandate that every citizen be treated identically, rather, it requires an adequate explanation for treating groups differently. Race-based distinctions are inherently suspect and are therefore subject to the most searching examination. *Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.*, 476 U.S. 267, 273, 90 L. Ed. 2d 260, 106 S. Ct. 1842 (1986). The BPD's racially-based promotional decision must withstand strict scrutiny -- the government must show that the classification is narrowly tailored to further a compelling

governmental interest.[6] *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena*, 515 U.S. 200, 227, 132 L. Ed. 2d 158, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995).

Whether each proffered reason satisfies strict scrutiny is a question of law or a question of how the law applies to the facts; therefore, our review is plenary. *Wessmann v. Gittens*, 160 F.3d 790, 795 (1st Cir. 1998).

In order to be a "compelling interest," the government must show that the alleged objective was its actual purpose for the discriminatory classification and must have a "strong basis in evidence to support that justification before it implements the classification." *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899, 908 n.4, 135 L. Ed. 2d 207, 116 S. Ct. 1894 (1996). Appellants argue that the Department only presented one justification for its decision to the HRD, and is therefore barred from asserting any other motivations. We disagree. Commissioner Evans testified that there were several reasons for his decision to depart from strict rank order in awarding promotions, including remedying past discrimination, avoiding lawsuits, and the operational needs of the Department. It is plausible

---

[6] The district court stated that "the burden of persuasion rests upon the Plaintiffs to show that the promotion decisions were unconstitutional." *Cotter*, 193 F. Supp. 2d at 338 (citing *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277-78 (O'Connor, J., concurring)). While it is true that the ultimate burden of proof in a civil trial lies with the plaintiffs, the Supreme Court has made clear that the government has a burden of production to justify a racial preference. *See Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 224; *cf. United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533, 135 L. Ed. 2d 735, 116 S. Ct. 2264 (1996) (placing the burden on the state to justify a gender classification).

that the Department did not feel the need to identify the multiple factors influencing its decision. If any of the justifications is a compelling state interest, and the City's actions were narrowly tailored to that end, the City's actions are constitutional.[7]

C. Remedying Past Discrimination

The City asserts that the race-conscious action was necessary to ameliorate "vestiges" of past discrimination by the Department against African-American applicants and officers. The remedying of past discrimination is a compelling state interest, so long as there is a "strong basis in evidence for the conclusion that the [government action] serves a remedial purpose with respect to past discrimination." *Stuart v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446, 450 (1st Cir. 1991) (citation omitted); *Boston Police Superior Officers Federation v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13, 20 (1st Cir. 1998) (hereinafter "*Boston Superior Officers*"). There must be evidence of discrimination specific to the governmental agency seeking to use racial preference; "societal" discrimination, on its own, will not support affirmative action. *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 276. "Whether past discrimination necessitates current action is a fact-sensitive inquiry." *Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 802. The "strong basis in evidence" may consist of "either a

---

[7] Appellants also argue that the government is prohibited from asserting alternative "compelling interests" because if one interest fails it demonstrates that the action taken by the government cannot be narrowly tailored, and the entire action therefore fails. We disagree with this argument. A governmental actor may have several reasons for racially-motivated action; if any legitimate reason satisfies strict scrutiny, the action is constitutional.

contemporaneous or antecedent finding of past discrimination by a court or other competent body, or evidence approaching a prima facie case of a constitutional or statutory violation." *Boston Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 20 (citation omitted).

The Department's history of discrimination is well-documented by past litigation and records. We outlined the history of past discrimination at the Department a few years ago in *Boston Superior Officers*, where we found:

> In 1972, we affirmed a district court's finding that the BPD discriminated against black applicants through the use of entry-level testing procedures that favored whites. . . . That discrimination resulted in a gross racial disparity among the BPD's ranks .
>
> . . .
>
> [Nineteen years later we found] . . . that racial discrimination in entry-level hiring had adversely affected blacks' representation at the rank of sergeant. "Remedial action takes time," we reasoned, "and discrimination may linger for many years in an organization that had excluded blacks from its ranks."

Boston Superior Officers, 147 F.3d at 20 (quoting *Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 452). In his deposition, Commissioner Evans also expressed the concern that remedying past discrimination

takes time.[8] The Department has been working for many years to address racial disparity and bias within its ranks. In 1965, only two percent of police officers in the City were not Caucasian, and only one minority held a position of sergeant or above. In 1978, only five-and-a-half percent of officers were African-American, and only three officers held a position of sergeant or above. While the numbers are more representative today, we are not prepared to rule that all effects of past discrimination have been eliminated. *See Boston Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 23 ("Given the BPD's halting and, at time, quite modest progress in remedying its earlier discrimination, we are reluctant to infer that the vestiges of that discrimination had substantially disappeared when the BPD [made the affirmative action promotion at issue.]").

At the time of the promotions at issue here, the disparity between the number of African-American officers eligible for

---

[8] Commissioner Evans stated:

> When I came on the Department there [were] very small numbers of minority officers, and I think there [were] none in my class of 66, and pretty much my class and classes before me are running the organization right now, . . . and I think it takes a while within any organization, that there has to be role models and other people in position so that other people will move up and I think it takes a while for that type of historic discrimination that was found in *Castro v. Beecher*, [459 F.2d 725 (1st Cir. 1972)]to work itself out. It doesn't happen overnight.

promotion and the number of non-African-American officers eligible for promotion was statistically significant. One explanation for this discrepancy is the fact that the rankings were based, in part, on experience. Because of the well-documented history of discrimination within the Department, fewer African-Americans are in position to be promoted to sergeant. *See United States v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 168, 94 L. Ed. 2d 203, 107 S. Ct. 1053 (1987) ("Discrimination at the entry level necessarily precluded blacks from competing for promotions, and resulted in a departmental hierarchy dominated exclusively by nonminorities.").

The Department was faced with facts that its efforts at remedying past discrimination had not been successful. A public employer has the requisite firm basis for believing that remedial action is necessary if there is a statistical disparity between the racial composition of the workforce and the relevant, qualified employment pool. *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 292 (O'Connor, J., concurring); *see also Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 803 ("The greater the disparity [between the number of qualified minority applicants with those who gain entrance], the stronger the inference that discrimination is the cause of non-entry.").

In October, 1996 (the latest date before the African-American Officers were promoted for which data is available), African-Americans comprised 25.02% of the BPD's 1,547 officers, but only 16.49% of the BPD's sergeants. This difference is statistically significant, and not reasonably attributed to chance. This disparity is not just a simple assurance of good intention from the City, but concrete evidence that discrimination existed at the time the African-American Officers were promoted.

In addition, as noted above, had the Department promoted in strict rank order, the selection rate for African-Americans would have been only three percent, while the selection rate for Caucasians would have been fifteen percent. This would have yielded a selection ratio of twenty percent, well below the eighty percent guideline established by the EEOC, and therefore suggested adverse impact on minorities. While not "conclusive evidence of discrimination," this discrepancy in selection rate does serve as a "'benchmark against which . . . to gauge [the City's] efforts to remedy past discrimination.'" *Boston Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 21 (quoting *Local 28, Sheet Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. EEOC*, 478 U.S. 421, 478, 92 L. Ed. 2d 344, 106 S. Ct. 3019 (1986) (plurality opinion)). In this case, the selection ratio would have been only twenty percent, indicating that the City had not yet remedied past discrimination.

Commissioner Evans, who made the decision to promote the African-American Officers, was aware of racial tensions within the Department. Officers had complained to him about disparate treatment, including racially-based punishment and job assignment. Officers had also complained to him that they felt racially targeted following an incident where a noose was placed on an officer's motorcycle.

The City's evidence of disparity in the promotion of officers to sergeant, current racial tensions within the Department, and the documented history of past discrimination within the BPD created the strong basis in evidence required for the Department to conclude that race-conscious action was necessary. Past discrimination in the hiring of minorities has limited the opportunity for minorities to move up through the ranks, and recent statistics show that

these effects remain. We hold that the City has therefore demonstrated that it acted in response to a compelling state interest -- that of remedying past discrimination. *See Majeske v. City of Chicago*, 218 F.3d 816, 823 (7th Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1079, 148 L. Ed. 2d 676, 121 S. Ct. 779 (2001) (holding that statistical evidence of disparity within a police department coupled with anecdotal evidence of discrimination sufficiently establishes a compelling state interest that justifies an affirmative action plan). At this point in time, we find that the City has presented sufficient evidence that past discrimination within the Department justified its race-conscious decision.

Next, we determine whether the action taken by the City in its effort to remedy past discrimination was narrowly tailored to rectify the specific harm in question. *Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 807. We consider several factors in determining whether an affirmative action order was narrowly tailored, including

> the extent to which (i) the beneficiaries of the order are specially advantaged; (ii) the legitimate expectancies of others are frustrated or encumbered; (iii) the order interferes with other valid state or local policies; and (iv) the order contains (or fails to contain) built-in mechanisms which will, if time and events warrant, shrink its scope and limit its duration.

Boston Superior Officers, 147 F.3d at 23 (quoting *Mackin v. Boston*, 969 F.2d 1273, 1278 (1st Cir. 1992)).

The City departed from strict rank order to promote three African-American officers out of thirty-six promotions. The Department would have had to promote twenty African-American officers to create a situation whereby the percentage of African-American officers and African-American sergeants was approximately equal. The necessity for relief was great, but the means chosen by the Department were modest -- only three African-American officers were promoted out of rank -- indicating narrow tailoring. *See McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1224 ("The [narrow tailoring] test is . . . whether the increase is a plausible lowerbound estimate of a shortfall in minority representation among [sergeants] that is due to the [Department's] intentional discrimination in the past.").

Only qualified minorities were promoted; they were therefore not "specially," or unfairly advantaged by their promotions. *See Boston Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 24. All officers were competing for a limited number of spots. Because of this competition, the City's promotion of the African-American Officers did not disturb any legitimate, firmly rooted expectations of the appellants. *See id.; accord Mackin*, 969 F.2d at 1278. Had the City not departed from strict rank order, no additional Caucasian officers would have been hired.[9] *See McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1222 (defining narrow tailoring as that which "discriminates against Caucasians as little as possible consistent with effective remediation").

---

[9] Had the City not considered race in the promotions, only thirty promotions would have been made -- twenty-nine Caucasian officers and one African-American officer. As a result of the affirmative action plan, those same twenty-nine Caucasian officers were promoted.

No valid policies have been disturbed by hiring three qualified African-American sergeants. While Massachusetts law requires an explanation for promotions made outside of strict rank order, there is no prohibition on such out-of-rank decisions. *See* Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27.

Finally, there were no quotas or long-term guidelines established, and there is nothing in the decision requiring affirmative action in future decisions. The decision is therefore limited in scope and duration. We therefore agree with the district court that the City's actions were a narrowly-tailored means of addressing demonstrated past discrimination.[10]

---

[10] We need not reach the issues of whether avoiding litigation or meeting the operational needs of the Department are compelling state interests. We are skeptical of the first justification, however: the City's claim that it promoted the African-American Officers in order to avoid litigation rings hollow, as litigation nevertheless ensued. We are much more sympathetic to the argument that communities place more trust in a diverse police force and that the resulting trust reduces crime rates and improves policing. This operational needs justification has been cited as a compelling state interest by other Circuits. *See Patrolmen's Benevolent Ass'n of N.Y., Inc. v. City of N.Y.*, 310 F.3d 43, 52 (2d Cir. 2002) ("[A] law enforcement body's need to carry out its mission effectively, with a workforce that appears unbiased, is able to communicate with the public and is respected by the community it serves, may constitute a compelling state interest.") (quotation and citation omitted); *Reynolds v. City of Chicago*, 296 F.3d 524, 530 (7th Cir. 2002); *McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1222; *Wittmer v. Peters*, 87 F.3d 916 (7th Cir. 1996); *cf. United States v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 167 n.18, 94 L. Ed. 2d 203, 107 S. Ct. 1053 (1987) (not deciding whether operational needs could be a compelling state

D. Retained Jurisdiction

At the conclusion of its analysis, the district court sought to eliminate future litigation regarding race-based decisions by the City. Analogizing to the *cy pres* doctrine of trusts and estates, whereby parties may petition the court to modify the purpose of a gift because the original purpose has become impractical or impossible, the court retained jurisdiction to review future race-conscious decisions by the City. The court held:

> Accordingly, this Court will retain jurisdiction post judgment, and directs the City, whenever the Department seeks to use racial factors in hiring or promotion decisions, to formulate its personnel decision and then petition the Court for instructions concerning whether such a racially motivated decision passes constitutional muster. The Department shall so petition this Court both when it "reaches down" to hire or promote a lower scoring individual on the basis of race, and when it picks among candidates who are tied on a civil service exam on the basis of race. On its part, the Court will give notice to all affected parties, including MAMLEO, and promptly will hold a hearing, entertain argument, and render a decision. Done properly, such a procedure ought further predictability, hold down the burgeoning legal costs of this sort of

---

interest).

> litigation, and, most important, further the general societal acceptance of the required nuanced balancing.

Cotter, 193 F. Supp. 2d at 356-57.

Whether the district court has the authority to retain jurisdiction is a question of law that we review de novo. See *David C. v. Leavitt*, 242 F.3d 1206, 1209-10 (10th Cir. 2001). If the court has such discretion, we review its decision for an abuse of discretion. *See id.* at 1210.

A federal court may exercise ancillary jurisdiction to enforce its judgments. *Peacock v. Thomas*, 516 U.S. 349, 354, 133 L. Ed. 2d 817, 116 S. Ct. 862 (1996); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1367 ("in any civil action over which the district courts have original jurisdiction, the district courts shall have supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action . . . that they form part of the same case and controversy."). While a federal court has the power to retain jurisdiction to enforce its decision, the Supreme Court has cautioned against the exercise of ancillary jurisdiction "over proceedings that are entirely new and original." *Peacock*, 516 U.S. at 358 (internal quotation omitted).

With respect to the district court's attempt to retain jurisdiction over future hiring decisions, neither party addressed hiring at any point in the litigation. The hiring policies of the BPD were not before the court, and it therefore lacks authority to retain jurisdiction over those absent claims. *Cf. Rodriguez v. Doral Mort. Co.*, 57 F.3d 1168, 1174 (1st Cir. 1995) ("A federal district court may not, of its own

volition, after the parties have rested, recast the complaint and, without notice, predicate its decision on a theory that was neither pleaded nor tried.").

In addition to the standing requirement discussed in Part IIA, *supra*, Article III's cases and controversies language prohibits federal courts from issuing advisory opinions. *Preiser v. Newkirk*, 422 U.S. 395, 401, 45 L. Ed. 2d 272, 95 S. Ct. 2330 (1975). A court may not "decide questions that cannot affect the rights of litigants in the case" before it. *Id.* (quotation and citation omitted). The issue of racial preference in hiring by the BPD was never a live, on-going case or controversy in this litigation, and any future decision by the district court regarding hiring would simply be an advisory opinion. The district court therefore lacked subject matter jurisdiction to retain jurisdiction over hiring decisions of the Department.

We further conclude that the retention of jurisdiction over future promotional decisions was an abuse of discretion. "Ancillary enforcement jurisdiction is, at its core, a creature of necessity. When a party has obtained a valid federal judgment, only extraordinary circumstances, if any, can justify ancillary jurisdiction over a subsequent" action. *Peacock*, 516 U.S. at 359. There are simply no extraordinary circumstances in this case necessitating the retention of jurisdiction.

First, the district court found *in favor* of the City, and upheld the racially-motivated promotional decision. There was no order by the district court that required enforcement and there is no longer a live issue in this case. Second, this case is not analogous to the situations where the Supreme

Court has found continued jurisdiction necessary. Such measures were taken in school desegregation cases, where retention of jurisdiction was necessary because of the continued refusal of school districts to rectify their unconstitutional segregation, and prison reform cases, where continued jurisdiction was necessary because states refused to follow court orders. *See Regensburger v. City of Bowling Green*, 278 F.3d 588, 598 (6th Cir. 2002) (Batchelder, J., concurring) (finding that a case was not analogous to school desegregation or prison reform cases, and that the district court therefore abused its discretion in retaining jurisdiction); *Sierra Club v. Lynn*, 502 F.2d 43, 66-67 (5th Cir. 1974) (finding no constitutional basis to support continued exercise of federal judicial power where no analogy could be made to desegregation cases). In the present case, the City has done nothing to violate appellants' constitutional rights, and has never demonstrated unwillingness to comply with a court order. Further, there is no evidence that the City will make future unjustified race-based decisions simply because it has prevailed in this case. The City has not behaved in such a way that would require ongoing supervision of its decisions.

The district court was frustrated in being faced with a lawsuit challenging affirmative action after what the court perceived as the City's promise, in a prior lawsuit, that it would no longer use affirmative action. *See Cotter*, 193 F. Supp. 2d at 355. We believe that the district court misreads *Boston Superior Officers*, which did not include a promise by the City to refrain from race-conscious decisionmaking. Rather, the fact that the Department promoted one sergeant, rather than establishing a quota or some other long-term program, demonstrated that the action was narrowly tailored. *Boston Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 25. Furthermore, we

explicitly left open the question of whether the Department could make future race-based decisions. We stated:

> Our conclusion that the BPD was justified in taking race-based remedial action is based strictly on these unique circumstances, and does not give the BPD a license to depart from strict rank order in future promotions. *Whether any similar factors are left that might warrant future remedial action is a question that we need not now address . . . .*

Id. (emphasis added). So long as the City's actions are constitutional (as the promotion of the African-American Officers was in this case), the City is permitted to consider race in its decisions.

We have no doubt that a lawsuit will be filed should appellants or anyone else believe that a future racially-motivated decision of the Department violates their constitutional rights. Subject to the standing requirements discussed above, this will create an actual case or controversy for the federal courts to adjudicate. Until that time, the court lacks the power and necessity to decide constitutional issues regarding the City's promotional decisions.

In short, the district court lacked the subject matter jurisdiction to retain jurisdiction over future hiring decisions, and lacked the necessity required to retain jurisdiction over future promotional decisions. We therefore vacate the district court's retention of jurisdiction over future race-based decisions of the Department. "This solution relegates the federal judiciary to its proper limited position, allows the

legislative branch full sway within constitutional boundaries, and prevents continuing friction between the federal judiciary and a state entity." *Regensburger*, 278 F.3d at 598-99 (Batchelder, J., concurring).

III. Conclusion

"The unhappy persistence of both the practice and the lingering effects of racial discrimination against minority groups in this country is an unfortunate reality, and government is not disqualified from acting in response to it." *Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 237. The City has sought to remedy its past discrimination within the Department through the selective promotion of three African- American officers. The City's action was constitutional. There is no reason for the district court to retain sweeping jurisdiction over all hiring and promotional race-conscious decisions of the Department.

We therefore affirm the district court's decision that the City's actions did not violate appellants' constitutional rights and reverse the district court's retention of jurisdiction.

Affirmed in part and reversed in part.

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 99-11101-WGY

[Decided March 21, 2002]

WINIFRED N. COTTER, VINCENT J. DIFAZIO, JOHN P. DORIS, WILLIAM J. DWAN, WILLIAM G. KNECHT, MICHAEL LOCKE, PATRICK L. MURPHY, and THOMAS L. SEXTON,
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF BOSTON,
Defendant,

and

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, DENNIS A. WHITE, and HAROLD WHITE,
Defendant-Intervenors.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YOUNG, C.J.

I. INTRODUCTORY BACKGROUND

This is a case of alleged racial discrimination. Such cases come in two types.

The first involves allegations of public or private racial discrimination which are denied. While such cases give rise to complex problems of proof, the duty of a court once racial discrimination is established is clear and undoubted -- to extirpate racial discrimination root and branch, adequately compensate its victims, and creatively invoke its equitable powers to provide equal opportunity to all citizens free of the blight of racial animus.

The second involves state-sponsored racial discrimination. Since, in certain narrowly-tailored circumstances, such state sponsored discrimination is at present undoubtedly lawful, such cases necessarily involve an exploration of whether justifying circumstances exist. This is such a case.

At the outset, therefore, it is appropriate to acknowledge two extraordinarily difficult aspects of any such case which sadly but inevitably make its resolution suspect and less acceptable to our society as a whole than is usually the case with a carefully-considered judicial opinion.

The first is a problem of definition. As a society we acknowledge and bewail our deeply troubled racial history -- the horrors of slavery, the tawdry (and frequently violent) legacy of Jim Crow, the subtle (and not so subtle) resistance to conferring genuine equal rights and equal opportunities

upon all Americans. When we attack racial discrimination head on, problems of racial definition rarely arise because they are subsumed in the proof that a particular person or group has, in fact, been the victim of discrimination on the basis of racial animus.

When the state itself seeks to discriminate on the basis of "racial factors," however, and claims such discrimination is legally justified, then the problem of definition becomes acute because all Americans are vitally interested in precisely the basis upon which the state determines to confer governmental benefits such as jobs and promotions. Unfortunately, one searches the authoritative decisions in vain for any adequate definition. The decisions rather casually use terms such as "white," "black," "African American," "Hispanic," "Native American" and the like, as though we all agreed on their meaning in the specific case. Of course, we do not. *See generally, e.g.*, Rachel F. Moran, *The Mixed Promise of Multiculturalism*, 17 Harv. BlackLetter L.J. 47 (2001) (arguing that race is becoming a more fluid concept in America as demographics change, and that different racial groups have very different views on the desirability of embracing multiracial identities); Naomi Zack, *American Mixed Race: The U.S. 2000 Census and Related Issues*, 17 Harv. BlackLetter L.J. 33 (2001) (contending that race is a social and political construct, unsupported by biology, in which courts and lawmakers have acquiesced despite the absence of a foundation for doing so, and that legal recognition of mixed-race groups might help to break down rigid notions of race). There is more wisdom in Tiger Woods calling himself "Cablinasian," *see, e.g.*, Michael A. Fletcher, *Woods Puts Personal Focus on Mixed-Race Identity*, Wash. Post, Apr. 23, 1997, at A1, than in all the gross racial

classifications found in the governing decisions and the executive actions implementing race-based public policies.

Nor is the lack of definition surprising. If we go beyond self-definition and seek to confer some genuine meaning upon race-based identifiers, we rapidly find ourselves slipping into the most abhorrent racial stereotyping and classification -- the very conduct directly forbidden by our Constitution and laws. We simply cannot condemn the notorious black codes, *see, e.g.*, Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*, at 199-201 (1988) (outlining provisions of state black codes); Theodore Brantner Wilson, *The Black Codes and the South* 66-70, 72-75, 78-80 (1965) (same), and Nazi eugenics, *see, e.g.*, 4 Office of U.S. Chief of Counsel for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy & Aggression* 8-9 (1946) (Nazi citizenship law defining who is and who is not a Jew in order to disqualify Jews from German citizenship), *quoted in part in Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 448 U.S. 448, 534 n.5, 65 L. Ed. 2d 902, 100 S. Ct. 2758 (1980) (Stevens, J., dissenting), while at the same time looking behind self-identification. The very idea of imposing some lexicon of United States government racial definitions is revolting.

Here the parties neatly sidestep the issue. This case involves a certain police promotional examination. Those who took the exam were asked to assign themselves to one of a number of pre-fixed racial identifiers. Not everyone did so. Those who did not were nevertheless consigned to a pre-fixed racial classification from the records of the Boston Police Department. It is unclear whether these records are the result of self-classification or observations by someone within the

Department.[1] As no party here challenges or seeks to examine these racial classifications, the Court adopts them, pointing out here that they are in the main based on individual self-identification, while a minority of exam takers were somehow assigned a pre-fixed racial classification by the Boston Police Department.

Second, the most difficult aspect of this case is the basic premise upon which the Court is required to approach it. Simply stated, the premise is that, as we ultimately seek a colorblind society under our Constitution, it is necessary in certain circumstances to discriminate along racial lines to move toward that society. *See, e.g., Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265, 407, 57 L. Ed. 2d 750, 98 S. Ct. 2733 (1978) (Blackmun, J., concurring in the judgment in part and dissenting in part) ("In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race."). So imbedded is this premise in our constitutional jurisprudence that it is not for this Court to question it. Still, as discrimination necessarily begets discrimination, as racial discrimination is perhaps our society's most tragically divisive fault line, and as "our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher" that

---

[1] Racial classification of United States government employees is routine and is frequently done on the basis of cursory visual observation. The federal courts, for example, gather data about the racial and ethnic background of employees primarily by relying upon individual self-identification, but when an individual does not self-identify, "visual identification may serve as the basis for providing the information. (That is, supervisory personnel should observe individual employees and provide the data based on observations.)" Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts, *The FY 2001 Fair Employment Practices Report* 4 (2001).

"teaches the whole people by its example," *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 468, 72 L. Ed. 944, 48 S. Ct. 564 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting), one cannot help but recall the reflexive statement of the field artillery officer in Vietnam: "We had to destroy the village to save it."

II. PRIOR PROCEEDINGS

Winifred N. Cotter, Vincent J. DiFazio, John P. Doris, William J. Dwan, William G. Knecht, Michael Locke, Patrick L. Murphy, and Thomas L. Sexton (collectively the "Plaintiffs"), all members of the Boston Police Department (the "Department"), brought this section 1983 action against the City of Boston (the "City") and James J. Hartnett, Jr. ("Hartnett"), in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Human Resources Division (the "Division"). The Plaintiffs allege that the City and Hartnett unlawfully discriminated against them in promoting to the rank of sergeant three black officers (the "Black Officers") who scored 84 on a 1996 civil service exam (the "1996 exam"), while declining to promote the Plaintiffs, who also scored 84. The Plaintiffs claim that the City and Hartnett violated the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.[2] The Massachusetts Association of Minority

---

[2] The Court dismissed the Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment claim from the bench on January 9, 2001 [Docket No. 165]. The Fifth Amendment, though it does not expressly guarantee equal protection under law as does the Fourteenth Amendment, is generally understood to include within its due process guarantee an equal protection component akin to that found expressly in the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 499-500, 98 L. Ed. 884, 74 S. Ct. 693 (1954). This guarantee extends,

Law Enforcement Officers ("MAMLEO"), along with two of the Black Officers, Dennis A. White and Harold White, entered the lawsuit as defendant-intervenors after getting permission from the First Circuit, *Cotter v. Mass. Ass'n of Minority Law Enforcement Officers*, 219 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2000), while Hartnett exited the lawsuit by settling with the Plaintiffs.

All of the parties remaining have filed cross-motions for summary judgment. The City acknowledges that it considered race in making its promotion decisions, but responds that it is nonetheless entitled to summary judgment for two reasons. First, the City contends that the Plaintiffs lack standing to complain of the City's race-conscious decision because the City would not have promoted the Plaintiffs even if the City had made its promotion decisions without regard to race. Second, the City argues that even if the Plaintiffs have standing, the City's actions were narrowly tailored to further three compelling government interests: advancing the operational needs of the City by ensuring a diverse police force that represents the communities it serves, remedying past discrimination perpetrated by the Department against minorities, and avoiding a lawsuit from MAMLEO or disgruntled minority officers.

---

however, only to those denied the equal protection of the laws by the *federal* government. *E.g., Gerena v. P.R. Legal Servs., Inc.*, 697 F.2d 447, 449 (1st Cir. 1983). Those denied equal protection by the action of a state or local government are left to pursue relief under the Fourteenth Amendment. There are no federal actors involved in this litigation, and so the Plaintiffs' proper avenue of relief is under the Fourteenth Amendment, rather than the Fifth Amendment.

MAMLEO's motion for summary judgment focuses on the past discrimination of the Department, and on the disparate impact the 1996 exam had on minority officers vis-a-vis white officers. MAMLEO posits that the City's interests in complying with applicable federal antidiscrimination law and, correlatively, in avoiding a lawsuit from MAMLEO or others that they claim would have surely followed from the violation of such law, constitute compelling state interests. Completing the strict scrutiny two-step, MAMLEO argues that the City's actions were narrowly tailored to further those interests.

The Plaintiffs reject these arguments and respond with a summary judgment motion of their own. The thrust of the Plaintiffs' argument is that most of the justifications for the City's use of race in making the promotion decisions are *post hoc* rationalizations that were not considered by the City at the time it made the decisions. According to the Plaintiffs, the only justification that was actually considered at the time of the promotion decisions was compliance with the EEOC Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (the "EEOC Guidelines"), which the Plaintiffs claim are no longer applicable to the Department as a result of the expiration of a consent decree between the Department and MAMLEO that arose out of prior litigation. As such, according to the Plaintiffs, the City is left with no valid, much less constitutionally compelling, justification for its admittedly race-based actions. The Plaintiffs argue further that, even if any of the justifications proffered by the City were actually considered by the Department at the time the decisions were made, and even if they are ruled to be compelling by this Court, the promotion decisions were not narrowly tailored, because other, less race-conscious measures were available.

III. UNDISPUTED FACTS

On October 19, 1996, the Division administered the 1996 exam for the purpose of selecting police officers within the Department for promotion to the rank of sergeant. Am. Compl. ¶ 18 [Docket No. 13]; Callahan Aff. ¶ 8 [Docket No. 94]. Thirty-three black officers and 192 non-black officers achieved a passing score.[3] Callahan Aff. ¶ 11. In September 1997, the Department decided to promote 30 police officers to the rank of sergeant. *Id.* ¶ 8; Evans Aff. ¶ 3 [Docket No. 93]. In October 1997, the Division certified a list of 69 candidates from all of the applicants who passed the 1996 exam;[4] the scores of the candidates on the certified list ranged from 92 to 82. Am. Compl. Ex. A; Callahan Aff. Ex. A. It was from this list certified by the Division that the Department was to draw in making promotions to sergeant. In December 1997, the Department promoted 30 police

---

[3] A score of 70 or better was required to pass the written exam. Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 15 ¶ 6 (Expert Report of Kathleen K. Lundquist) [Docket No. 105].

[4] The Division places all applicants who pass a particular civil service exam on an "eligibility list." From the eligibility list, the Division places 2n + 1 candidates, with n representing the number of positions requisitioned by the particular agency, on a "certified list." It is from this certified list that the particular agency is to draw in making selection decisions and, with few exceptions, the agency is to proceed in strict numerical or rank order in making such decisions, selecting those who scored highest on the exam downward until the desired number of selections is made. Callahan Aff. PP 3-7.

officers to sergeant from the certified list. Evans Aff. ¶ 3; Callahan Aff. ¶ 8.

Before making the promotions, however, the Department discovered that if it promoted in strict rank order from one to 30, 29 non-black officers and only one black officer would be promoted. *Id.* ¶ 9. The Department further learned that such a promotion plan would violate the EEOC Guidelines "four-fifths rule," which states that a selection procedure adversely impacts minorities if it yields a selection percentage for candidates from a minority group that is less than four-fifths of the selection percentage for non-minority candidates, 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D).[5] Callahan Aff. ¶ 9. Specifically, the Department calculated that if it promoted only one black officer out of the 33 black officers who passed the 1996 exam (3% selection percentage) while promoting 29 non-black officers out of the 192 who passed the 1996 exam (15% selection percentage), the ratio of the black officer selection percentage to the non-black officer selection percentage would be around 20% (3% divided by 15%), *id.* Ex. B, well below the 80% required to avoid an inference of disparate impact. The Department therefore thought that it might be vulnerable to litigation by minority officers unless it promoted an additional three black officers, which would yield a total of four black officers promoted and would bring the Department

---

[5] The four-fifths rule specifically provides that "A selection rate for any race . . . which is less than four-fifths (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact." 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D).

into compliance with the four-fifths rule. This change would lead to a 12% selection percentage among black officers (4/33) compared to a 14% selection percentage among non-black officers (26/192), yielding a black/non-black selection percentage ratio of approximately 89%. *Id.* Ex. B.

The Department's December 1997 promotions therefore included the three Black Officers who scored 84 on the 1996 exam, but excluded five non-black applicants who scored 85 on the 1996 exam. Because the Department's promotion decisions departed from a strict rank order approach, the Department submitted an explanation to the Division for its decisions, as is required by law, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27. The Department explained to the Division that the Department believed that the departure was necessary in order "to ensure compliance with current EEOC guidelines, and applicable federal and state discrimination laws." Am. Compl. Ex. B. The Division, believing that the Department's explanation for the departure was premised on an incorrect assumption that the Department was still bound by a consent decree between MAMLEO and the City that had expired in 1995 which explicitly required the City to comply with the EEOC Guidelines, rejected this departure from strict rank ordering. *Id.* Ex. D.

Because the Department had already made the promotion decisions that were now being challenged by the Division, it was loathe to alter its decision in a way that would require it to rescind offers of promotion already made. Accordingly, the Department responded to the Division's objection by requisitioning from the Division six additional sergeant positions, so that the Department could promote the five officers who scored 85 on the 1996 exam who were bypassed

under the original proposal, Evans Aff. ¶ 8, and one officer who was originally bypassed for cause, Callahan Aff. at 4 nn.1-2, while maintaining the promotional status of the Black Officers, Am. Compl. Ex. G. This yielded a total of 36 new sergeants, 32 of whom were white, four of whom were black. Callahan Aff. ¶ 15. The Division did not object to this arrangement. *Id.* ¶ 14. Although the revised promotion arrangement technically proceeded in strict rank order, ten white officers who scored 84 were not promoted. Seven of those officers filed suit against the City and Hartnett, in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator for the Division.

Since the promotions at issue in this case, the Department has not relied on the 1996 exam to make any more promotions to the rank of sergeant. Callahan Aff. ¶ 16. Another exam was administered in 1998, *id.* ¶ 17, and all promotions to sergeant since the ones at issue here have proceeded in strict rank order, except for bypasses for cause, which are usually for disciplinary reasons, Evans Aff. ¶ 13.

IV. DISCUSSION

The parties do not dispute the facts as they are presented above. The Plaintiffs allege that the City improperly took account of race when it made its promotions decisions based on the 1996 exam. The City acknowledges that it took account of race in making the promotion decisions. According to the City, however, its use of race was constitutionally permissible, a limited and targeted method of achieving the City's compelling government interests. This Court is thus not charged with the responsibility of assessing conflicting factual accounts to determine whether, when construed most favorably to the non-moving party, the facts would permit a

favorable ruling for that party (the typical trial court responsibility at the summary judgment stage). Rather, this Court must determine whether the reasons proffered by the City for its unmistakably race-conscious action are legally sufficient justifications.

Before turning to the merits of the Plaintiffs' Fourteenth Amendment claim, however, the Court addresses the question whether the Plaintiffs have standing to litigate this case in the first place.

A. Standing

The first defense raised by the City is its argument that the Plaintiffs would not have been promoted even if the Department had not taken account of race in making the promotions, and thus they have no standing to complain of the Department's use of race. City's Mem. at 4-6 [Docket No. 92].[6] In support of this contention, the City states that had it not been allowed to consider race in making promotions to sergeant from the 1996 exam, then *no one* who scored 84 on the exam, including the Plaintiffs, would have been promoted. *Id.* at 5; Evans Aff. ¶ 12. Instead, the City would have promoted 30 officers in accordance with its original

---

[6] This recently-filed memorandum appears to be the first time the City has raised the issue of standing. Because a challenge to a plaintiff's standing to pursue the case calls into question the jurisdiction of a federal court over the subject matter of the action, *Raines v. Byrd*, 521 U.S. 811, 818, 138 L. Ed. 2d 849, 117 S. Ct. 2312 (1997), however, the challenge may be raised by any party at any point during the litigation, and may in fact be raised by a court sua sponte, Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

requisition, but would have proceeded in strict rank order, meaning that only those candidates who scored 85 or higher, and only some of those who scored 85, would have been promoted. City's Mem. at 5; *see also* Am. Compl. Ex. A (certified list in rank order). The Plaintiffs, who scored 84, would not have been promoted even under this strict rank order approach.

1. Standing Generally

Article III of the Constitution limits the power of the federal courts to actual cases or controversies. *See* U.S. Const. art. III, § 2. To give meaning to this otherwise open-textured provision, the Supreme Court has established three criteria that form the "irreducible constitutional minimum" that must be shown in order for a plaintiff to have standing:

> First, the plaintiff must have suffered an injury in fact--an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized, and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical. Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of--the injury has to be fairly . . . traceable to the challenged action of the defendant, and not . . . the result [of] the independent action of some third party not before the court. Third, it must be likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61, 119 L. Ed. 2d 351, 112 S. Ct. 2130 (1992) (citations and internal

quotation marks omitted). The Court considers these three criteria in turn.

First, the Plaintiffs must show that they suffered injury in fact. In a case such as this, where a plaintiff alleges that a defendant accorded unequal treatment to the plaintiff on the basis of race while the plaintiff competed for a government benefit, injury in fact is established by showing "the denial of equal treatment resulting from the imposition of the barrier, not the ultimate inability to obtain the benefit." *Northeastern Fla. Chapter of Associated Gen. Contractors v. City of Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. 656, 666, 124 L. Ed. 2d 586, 113 S. Ct. 2297 (1993). In other words, the Plaintiffs need not show that they would have been promoted but for the race-consciousness of the Department in order to demonstrate that they suffered concrete, particularized injury. They "need only demonstrate" that they were "able and ready to [compete] and that a discriminatory policy prevented [them] from doing so on an equal basis." *Id.; see also Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena*, 515 U.S. 200, 210, 132 L. Ed. 2d 158, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995) ("Adarand need not demonstrate that it has been, or will be, the low bidder on a Government contract. The injury in cases of this kind is that a discriminatory classification prevent[s] the plaintiff from competing on an equal footing." (internal quotation marks omitted); *Wooden v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 247 F.3d 1262, 1279 (11th Cir. 2001) ("The Supreme Court's standing jurisprudence in this area unmistakably turns the focus away from . . . *result-oriented* analysis and toward a *process-oriented* analysis that asks whether the plaintiff has actually been *exposed* to unequal treatment.").

Here, the Plaintiffs took a civil service exam in good faith, aspiring to become sergeants. They indicated that they would accept the promotion if they were chosen. Am. Compl. Ex. A. By the objective measure of qualification for the job of sergeant, they were identical to the Black Officers. But they were not considered for promotion because they were not black. This is the heartland of cognizable injury in a discrimination case. The Plaintiffs were not allowed to compete on an equal footing with the Black Officers because of their race. This is a sufficiently concrete, particularized, and personal injury to satisfy the first criterion of constitutional standing.

The second criterion of constitutional standing, causation, follows easily once injury in fact is defined correctly in a discrimination case. Due to the Department's decision to select three officers who scored 84 for promotion because of their race, ten other officers who also scored 84 were denied the opportunity to compete on an equal, race-neutral footing. There can be no doubt that the Department's actions, as opposed to the actions of some intervening third party, caused the Plaintiffs' inability to compete on an equal basis with the Black Officers.

To satisfy the third requirement of standing, redressability, the Plaintiffs need not show that they would have been promoted in the absence of the alleged discrimination. Instead, a plaintiff need only show that it is likely, as opposed to speculative, that a favorable ruling will redress the plaintiff's injury. *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 561. To hold that Plaintiffs must show that they would have been promoted in the absence of racial considerations would collapse the standing inquiry in discrimination cases into a

judgment on the merits of the case, and would require the plaintiff to demonstrate a winning case on the issues of causation and damages just to get through the courthouse doors. *See Wooden*, 247 F.3d at 1280. A contrary ruling would also eviscerate the Supreme Court's careful definition of injury in fact in discrimination cases, and replace it with a standard the Supreme Court has explicitly rejected. *Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 211; *City of Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. at 666. All the Plaintiffs need show at this point is that a favorable ruling -- a ruling that the City engaged in race-conscious decision making that is either not justified by a compelling interest or not narrowly tailored to achieve that interest -- would redress their legal injury. If the Court were so to rule, the Plaintiffs would be allowed to compete in future rounds of promotions on an equal footing with other officers without regard to race. The Plaintiffs' injury, properly understood, is thus redressable by a favorable ruling on the merits.

The City relies principally on two cases, one from the Supreme Court, one from the District of Massachusetts, for the proposition that the Plaintiffs must show that they would have been promoted in the absence of improper consideration of race by the City in order to have standing to proceed. In *Texas v. Lesage*, 528 U.S. 18, 145 L. Ed. 2d 347, 120 S. Ct. 467 (1999) (per curiam), the Supreme Court held that "even if the government has considered an impermissible criterion in making a decision adverse to the plaintiff, it can nonetheless defeat liability by demonstrating that it would have made the same decision absent the forbidden consideration." *Id.* at 20-21. In *Lesage*, the Supreme Court granted summary judgment to the University of Texas against an unsuccessful applicant to the University's graduate school of education who sought damages based on the University's

consideration of race in admitting and rejecting applicants. The University admitted that it considered race in making admissions decisions, but argued that Lesage, who ranked below 73 of the 223 applicants for 20 spots in terms of grades and GRE scores, would not have been admitted even if the University had been barred from considering race. *Id.* at 19.

Lesage is not instructive on the issue of standing, but instead addresses how a defendant in a discrimination case may defeat liability *on the merits* even though the plaintiff has shown that the defendant impermissibly considered race in making the challenged decision. The Supreme Court did not mention standing specifically in *Lesage*. Instead, the Supreme Court referenced *Mount Healthy, City Board of Education v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 50 L. Ed. 2d 471, 97 S. Ct. 568 (1977), a case in which the Supreme Court held that a defendant may defeat liability on the merits for a constitutional violation (in that case, terminating the plaintiff for engaging in protected speech) by showing by a preponderance of the evidence that the same decision would have been made in the absence of the constitutional violation, *id.* at 285-87. *Lesage*, 528 U.S. at 20-21. *Mount Healthy* addresses the issue of causation in constitutional tort cases. It permits the defendant to show that legitimate as opposed to impermissible factors were the principal cause of the plaintiff's harm. *Mount Healthy*, and accordingly *Lesage*, do not address the question whether the Plaintiffs have made the threshold showing that they may bring a suit in the first instance. *See Saunders v. White*, 191 F. Supp. 2d 95, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3573, 2002 WL 338744, at *12 n.21 (D.D.C. 2002) (observing several problems with the approach of other courts to equate *Lesage* with standing, specifically that *Lesage* does not mention standing explicitly and that such

an approach "unnecessarily conflates the standing inquiry with the actual merits the plaintiff's claim"). *But see Wooden*, 247 F.3d at 1277 (suggesting that, in spite of the absence of reference to standing in *Lesage*, the decision "plainly bears on that [kind of] inquiry"); *Boston's Children First v. Boston Sch. Comm.*, 183 F. Supp. 2d 382, 393 (D. Mass. 2002) (Stearns, J.) ("If the result would have been the same, regardless of the plaintiff's race . . . the plaintiff . . . would lack standing."). The Court therefore rejects the argument that *Lesage* compels a denial of *standing* to a plaintiff who cannot conclusively show that, absent the impermissible government action, he or she would have received the government benefit sought.

The City also relies upon *Donahue v. City of Boston*, 183 F. Supp. 2d 202 (D. Mass. 2001) (Tauro, J.), a case in which the court dismissed on standing grounds a claim of reverse discrimination brought by a white applicant to become an officer of the Boston Police Department, based on the fact that during one round of hiring, "the Department would have had to consider 586 applicants ahead of Donahue for thirteen spots," while during a second round of hiring "the Department would have had to consider 117 candidates for . . . seven spots before it reached Donahue." *Id.* at 209.

Donahue is distinguishable from the facts of this case. In *Donahue*, the court denied standing to a competitor for a government benefit, even though the defendant admitted that it took account of race in making its decisions, because the plaintiff "was eliminated from possible appointment before race . . . was a factor." *Id.* at 208-09. In other words, Donahue was not denied the opportunity to compete on an equal footing with those of all races. He simply was

eliminated from the competition before the competition became unequal. He thus did not suffer the kind of injury that discrimination lawsuits are designed to redress.

Donahue resembles *Wooden* insofar as Wooden denied standing to one plaintiff who challenged the University of Georgia's admittedly race-conscious admissions policy because that particular plaintiff was denied admission solely on the basis of grades and test scores, before the plaintiff even reached the stage of admissions decisions where race was taken into account, *Wooden*, 247 F.3d at 1281-83. *See Donahue*, 183 F. Supp. 2d at 208-09 (likening Donahue's circumstances to those of the Davis plaintiff in *Wooden*). *Donahue* also resembles a recent Sixth Circuit decision, *Aiken v. Hackett*, 281 F.3d 516, 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 2522, 2002 WL 232931 (6th Cir. 2002), where that court ruled that plaintiffs, who were not among a group of white police officers who were "bumped" in order to promote black officers out of rank order to sergeant, lacked standing to litigate an antidiscrimination case. In *Aiken*, the court stated that it was "beyond debate" that the plaintiffs would not have been promoted to sergeant in the absence of an affirmative action program, because the plaintiffs' "composite scores (not the City's affirmative action program) kept them from being promoted." 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 2522, [WL] at *3.

These cases -- *Donahue, Wooden*, and *Aiken* -- do not resemble this case. The plaintiffs in those cases were so clearly out of the running for the government benefits they sought that race never became an issue in their competition. Here, the Plaintiffs were on the cusp of being promoted to sergeant. They obtained the exact same score on the 1996 exam that the Black Officers obtained. Had the Department

been forced to proceed in a strictly race-neutral fashion, it is possible that the Department, in pursuit of more promotions of black officers to sergeant, would have promoted all the candidates who scored 84 on the 1996 exam, including the Plaintiffs. This is especially so given the fact that the Department informed the original 30 officers who were promoted of their promotions *before* explaining its departure from strict rank order to the Division and readjusting its promotion plan in response to the Division's objections. *See* Evans Aff. ¶ 8. Rather than rescind offers of promotion it made to some of those officers upon learning of the Division's objection to the Department's promotion decisions, the Department simply requisitioned more sergeant positions. *Id.*; Callahan Aff. ¶ 15. It is thus possible that, had the Department been forced to ignore race altogether, it would have requisitioned enough sergeant positions to promote everyone who scored 84 or better, in order to maintain the promotion status of the Black Officers, but in a completely race-neutral fashion. This would have allowed the Department to promote four black officers to sergeant, rather than just one, even if it meant promoting an additional 10 non-black police officers to sergeant. And, of course, this would have led to the promotion of the Plaintiffs.

For these reasons, the Court is satisfied that the Plaintiffs have made the requisite showing under *Lujan* that they have standing to litigate this case.

2. Standing to Seek Injunctive Relief

MAMLEO asserts that Plaintiffs lack standing to seek injunctive relief. Relying upon *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 75 L. Ed. 2d 675, 103 S. Ct. 1660 (1983),

MAMLEO argues that the Plaintiffs have made no showing that they will be affected by the allegedly unlawful conduct of the City in the future, as is required for a plaintiff to have standing to seek injunctive relief. MAMLEO's Mem. at 20 [Docket No. 108].

In order to have standing to seek injunctive relief, a plaintiff must not only satisfy the requirements of standing outlined in *Lujan*, but must also establish a "real and immediate threat" that the alleged wrongful conduct will be perpetrated by the defendant against the plaintiff again in the future. *Lyons*, 461 U.S. at 105; *see also Blake v. Southcoast Health Sys., Inc.*, 145 F. Supp. 2d 126, 132-34 (D. Mass. 2001) (applying *Lyons*). In *Lyons*, the plaintiff was injured after being placed in a control choke hold by members of the Los Angeles Police Department during a routine traffic stop. The plaintiff sought injunctive relief against further use of the choke hold by the Department except in cases where the target of the choke hold threatened immediate use of deadly force. The Supreme Court held that the plaintiff lacked standing to seek injunctive relief, explaining that in order to have such standing the plaintiff

> would have had not only to allege that he would have another encounter with the police but also to make the incredible assertion either (1) that *all* police officers in Los Angeles *always* choke any citizen with whom they happen to have an encounter, whether for the purpose of arrest, issuing a citation, or for questioning, or (2) that the City ordered or authorized police officers to act in such a manner.

Id., 461 U.S. at 105-06. Because the plaintiff failed to make such a showing, the Supreme Court denied standing to the plaintiff to seek injunctive relief.

In this case, however, the Plaintiffs make out the requisite showing to seek an injunction against future consideration of race by the Department in making promotions. The Plaintiffs' counsel represents that the Plaintiffs have taken and will continue to take future civil service exams in pursuit of promotion to sergeant. Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 5 [Docket No. 111]. In continuing to seek promotion to sergeant, the Plaintiffs may be exposed to the same of kind of deliberate decision on the part of the Department to treat candidates differently because of their race. To be sure, the City states that all promotions since the ones at issue here have proceeded in strict rank order. Evans Aff. ¶ 13. But this is no guarantee that future promotion decisions, particularly those where the candidates have identical exam scores, will not be made on the basis of race. Police Commissioner Paul F. Evans stated during a deposition that he alone makes determinations regarding what percentage of minority officers at all ranks represents meaningful diversity on the force. Freidel Aff. Ex. 2, at 82-83 (Deposition of Paul F. Evans, day two) [Docket No. 142]. He also stated that he believes he has complete discretion to choose among candidates for promotion with identical scores on the exam. *Id.* at 84. Given this state of affairs, it is reasonable to expect that in the future the Plaintiffs might obtain a score on a promotion exam identical to candidates of other races, and yet be denied promotion while candidates of other races are promoted. The Commissioner has stated that it is his prerogative to exercise what he believes to be lawful discretion vested in him to achieve what he decides is an appropriate racial balance

within the sergeant ranks. At the very least, it may be said that the Plaintiffs will take the test again in the future and may participate in a competition in which they are not on an equal footing with candidates of other races. In short, they face the kind of real and immediate threat of injury that antidiscrimination law is designed to redress. They thus may pursue equitable as well as legal relief.

B. Permissibility of the Promotions Under Strict Scrutiny

The parties are in agreement that the City's actions in making promotions on the basis of race are subject to strict scrutiny. *Adarand*, 515 U.S. at 227; *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469, 493-94, 102 L. Ed. 2d 854, 109 S. Ct. 706 (1989). This is true regardless of the race of the party singled out by the classification, and regardless of whether the race singled out is burdened or benefitted by the classification. *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 494 ("The standard of review under the Equal Protection Clause is not dependent on the race of those burdened or benefitted by a particular classification."). Once government action is subject to strict scrutiny, it is incumbent upon the government to demonstrate that the action is supported by a compelling government interest, and that the action is narrowly tailored to further the compelling interest. *Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.*, 476 U.S. 267, 274, 90 L. Ed. 2d 260, 106 S. Ct. 1842 (1986). This burden upon the government, however, is "merely one of production." *McLaughlin v. Boston Sch. Comm.*, 938 F. Supp. 1001, 1010 (D. Mass. 1996) (Garrity, J.). At all times, the burden of persuasion rests upon the Plaintiffs to show that the promotion decisions were unconstitutional. *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277-78, *id.* at 292-93 (O'Connor, J., concurring).

1. Compelling Interests

The City and MAMLEO proffer three interests they claim are compelling that were furthered by the promotion decisions at issue in this case. First, the City argues that the promotion decisions helped to effectuate the "operational needs" of the Department by ensuring a diverse police force, which is necessary in order to serve a community as diverse as Boston and which, according to the City, has been partly responsible for the precipitous drop in crime in Boston over the past decade. City's Mem. at 7-13. Second, the City and MAMLEO contend that the promotion decisions were necessary in order to remedy past discrimination within the Department. *Id.* at 17; MAMLEO's Mem. at 7-8. Finally, and related to the second justification, both the City and MAMLEO assert that the promotion decisions were required in order to stave off a lawsuit the City claims would have been brought by MAMLEO or disgruntled minority officers had the City promoted only one black officer out of a sergeant class of 30. City's Mem. at 17-18; MAMLEO' Mem. at 16-17.

Before examining each of these justifications individually to determine whether they are compelling, the Court offers a few general observations about compelling interests. The Supreme Court has offered little guidance on what constitutes such an interest. As the First Circuit observed in *Wessmann v. Gittens*, 160 F.3d 790 (1st Cir. 1998):

> We know that [race-conscious] state action is acceptable upon a showing . . . that it is needed to undo the continuing legacy of an institution's past discrimination. We also know

> that the [Supreme] Court has rejected the "role model" theory as a compelling interest. Beyond these examples, the case law offers relatively little guidance.

Id. at 795 (citations omitted). To these guideposts may be added the principle that "an effort to alleviate the effects of societal discrimination is not a compelling interest." *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899, 909-10, 135 L. Ed. 2d 207, 116 S. Ct. 1894 (1996). But that is all the help this Court has from above.

The Supreme Court has never held, however, that remedying past discrimination is the only interest that may be considered compelling, even though some justices have suggested as much, *e.g.*, *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 493 (O'Connor, J.) ("Unless [racial classifications] are strictly reserved for remedial settings, they may in fact promote notions of racial inferiority and lead to a politics of racial hostility."). The First Circuit, like other courts, has declined to hold that interests not linked to remedying past discrimination may never be compelling, in the absence of a directive from the Supreme Court to do so. *Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 795-96; *see also Wittmer v. Peters*, 87 F.3d 916, 919 (7th Cir. 1996) ("A judge would be unreasonable to conclude that no other consideration except a history of discrimination could ever warrant a discriminatory measure unless every other consideration had been presented to and rejected by him."). As such, this Court will not reject categorically non-remedial justifications for the Department's race-conscious decision. Instead, the Court must examine the particular justifications submitted by the City and make a legal determination about whether they are compelling in light of

the unique circumstances of the Boston Police Department. *See Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 798 (observing that when a court considers whether a particular interest asserted by the government is compelling, "the devil is in the details").

Additionally, in order for an interest proffered by a defendant to warrant consideration as a compelling interest, it must be an interest that actually motivated the defendant in making the decision at issue. As the Supreme Court stated in *Shaw v. Hunt*, a racial classification cannot withstand strict scrutiny based upon speculation about what may have motivated the decision maker. To be a compelling interest, the State must show that the alleged objective was the decision maker's *actual* purpose for the discriminatory classification. 517 U.S. at 908 n.4 (emphasis added) (internal quotation marks omitted). This requirement is consistent with the purpose of strict scrutiny, which is to "smoke out" the reasons why the government took the actions it did, in order to determine whether those reasons justify government consideration of race. *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 493; *cf. Miss. Univ. for Women v. Hogan*, 458 U.S. 718, 729-30 & n.16, 744, 73 L. Ed. 2d 1090, 102 S. Ct. 3331 (rejecting defendant's proffered justification of remedying discrimination against women in the nursing industry as the "actual purpose" for the state's all-female nursing school, because evidence suggested that almost all nurses within the state were female, and thus females were not discriminated against in the nursing industry). A defendant may not submit a *post hoc* rationalization for its race-conscious action where it is clear that such a justification never crossed the decision maker's mind at the time the decision was made. *See United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533, 135 L. Ed. 2d 735, 116 S. Ct. 2264 (1996) ("The justification [for a government

classification] must be genuine, not hypothesized or invented *post hoc* in response to litigation.").

Nevertheless, upon this record the Court rejects the Plaintiffs' suggestion that the only interest considered by the City at the time the promotions were made was the one articulated by the Department's Director of Human Resources, Edward P. Callahan, in a letter he sent to the Division explaining the Department's departure from strict rank order in promoting the Black Officers -- namely the desire to comply "with current EEOC guidelines, and with applicable federal and state discrimination laws," Am. Compl. Ex. B. *See* Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 8-10, 14-16 (arguing that this is the only interest that may be considered by the Court). When Commissioner Evans was asked at a deposition what his reasons were for promoting the Black Officers to the exclusion of the white officers with the same score on the 1996 exam, he replied, "adverse impact, a diversity at the higher ranks, and to help achieve community policing." Friedel Aff. Ex. 1, at 48 (Deposition of Paul F. Evans, day one).[7] Evans also stated in a signed report dated

---

[7] In the same portion of the deposition, Commissioner Evans, when asked if the need to increase diversity at the sergeant level prompted him to make the promotions at issue here, replied, "Yeah, I probably believed that, but the major reasons was the adverse impact, to avoid adverse impact." Freidel Aff. Ex. 1, at 46. Evans also stated that his "major purpose in promoting them was to avoid adverse impact and to have [the 1996 exam] challenged. There may have been secondary issues of increasing diversity at that but they were not my major purpose in promoting." *Id.* at 47. The Plaintiffs suggest that these statements mean that diversity was not actually considered by the Department at the time

July 13, 2001, that when he made the promotions at issue, he did so "to avoid adverse impact under the EEOC Guidelines 'four-fifths rule,' . . . and to ensure that the Department had a sufficient number of minority sergeants to execute its mission of community policing." Evans Decl. Ex. A, at 3 [Docket No. 96]. In the Court's view, the Plaintiffs have failed to create a genuine dispute about that fact that the City did consider its operational needs prior to promoting the Black Officers, and the Court will therefore examine that justification for the City's action to determine whether it constitutes a compelling interest.

a. Operational Needs

The first interest articulated by the City as a justification for its consideration of race in promoting the Black Officers is an interest in sustaining the "operational needs" of the Department. More specifically, the City argues that meaningful minority representation within the Department, including at the sergeant level, helps to foster cooperation between police officers and members of the diverse communities they serve, and therefore allows the Department

---

the decisions were made. Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 15. These statements do not impugn the City's claim that diversity was a consideration when the promotion decisions were made. The Commissioner's statement that he "probably" rather than unequivocally considered diversity does not mean that he did not consider such an interest, particularly in light of the remainder of his deposition testimony. And there is certainly no legal reason why a secondary, as opposed to a primary, motivation for taking race-based action may not be offered in defense of a race-conscious decision.

to protect and serve these communities more effectively. The Boston model of "community policing," in which the Department works with members of various communities to enhance crime prevention measures, offer young people alternatives to criminal activity, and protect communities against hardened criminals, would be in jeopardy, according to the Department, if it was forbidden to consider race in making promotion decisions, at least where the candidates are otherwise equally qualified. *E.g.*, Evans Decl. Ex. A, at 14. The Court explores the City's argument in greater detail below.

In 1990, crime in Boston reached an all-time high. The City faced a record 152 homicides, almost half of which were youth homicides. McDevitt Decl. Ex. A, at 7 (Expert Report of Jack McDevitt) [Docket No. 97]. Many of these homicides were concentrated in areas heavily populated by minorities, such as Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan. *Id.* In response, the City implemented a number of measures designed to work with these and other communities, in order to bolster public trust in and cooperation with police officers who were patrolling those communities. These measures included giving more power to officers at the beat and precinct level in order to give them greater flexibility to address the unique concerns of their communities, *id.* at 9; assigning officers to particular beats or neighborhoods on a permanent basis, so that officers could get to know and develop a rapport with members of that community, *id.* at 10; and creating a system of "collaboration among neighborhood residents, community, patrol officers, supervisors, members of the business community, clergy, service providers, academic institutions as well as state and federal law enforcement officials," *id.*

The results have been phenomenal. The homicide rate in Boston dropped from 152 in 1990 to 31 in 1999, *id.* at 12, its lowest level since 1961, Evans Decl. Ex. A, tab C, at 1 (City of Boston, *1999 Crime Summary Report*) [Docket No. 96]. Overall serious crime in Boston has been reduced by 48% since 1990. Id. Citizen complaints against Boston police officers decreased by 55 percent from 1993 to 1997. McDevitt Decl. Ex. A, at 15. To be sure, some of the decrease in crime and in complaints against police officers is no doubt due to other factors, such as the national economic boom experienced during this time. But the community policing model, which focuses on getting the entire community involved in preventing and fighting crime, deserves at least some of the credit for these numbers.

Police Commissioner Evans insists that the success of community policing depends on the ability of the Department to garner the trust of the citizens it serves. Evans Decl. Ex. A, at 5 (Report of Paul F. Evans); *see also* McDevitt Decl. Ex. A, at 6. In Commissioner Evans's opinion, "[a] critical component of developing trust, cooperation, and respect is ensuring diversity among the ranks of the Department." Evans Decl. Ex. A, at 5. This is due to the fact that "when members of the community [can] see themselves among the ranking police officers, they begin to be willing to work with us, rather than against us." *Id.* at 13. The Department depends on citizens to provide them with information about criminal activity within their neighborhood, assist in identifying offenders, and testify in court to convict these offenders, as well as to identify young persons who could benefit from services in order to be steered away from criminal activity. McDevitt Decl. Ex. A, at 13, 18, 24. Beyond helping to establish trust with a diverse community,

a diverse police force helps further the law enforcement goals of the Department. "For example, if there is an African American drug distribution network developing in a community, an African American officer, acting in an undercover capacity, is much more likely to be able to develop intelligence about the drug dealers involved than a white undercover officer could." *Id.* at 24.

The City argues that diversity is necessary to further its operational needs not only at the police officer level, but all the way up the ranks of the Department. "If [the Department] has a representative percentage of minority members but very few of those members have ever been promoted to a position of command or leadership the message sent back to the community is that the organization values diversity but only in certain roles, not in leadership positions." *Id.* at 25. Diversity at high levels of the Department may also be important to help mediate disputes between members of the community and officers on the beat, "particularly those that involve [minorities]." *Id.* at 26.

This Court understands the City's need to fight crime and maintain fruitful relationships with the communities served by the Department. The Court is also aware that some courts have been particularly receptive to diversity-based arguments in the law enforcement context. *E.g., Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 795; *Wittmer*, 87 F.3d at 919 (collecting cases). Ultimately, however, the Court cannot accept the City's argument that

operational needs justify race-conscious decision making on the part of the Department for the indefinite future.[8]

---

[8] The City, which has claimed its right to a jury trial from the inception of this litigation, argues that it has the right to a jury's determination of this issue.

Not so. What constitutes a compelling interest is matter of law. *See, e.g., Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 274-76 (rejecting, as matter of law, remedying societal discrimination and providing role models to young minorities as compelling justifications for race-conscious action); *Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 795 ("Because the issues advanced in this appeal -- specifically, whether diversity and curing vestiges of past discrimination satisfy strict scrutiny -- raise either questions of law or questions about how the law applies to discerned facts, our review is essentially plenary."). True, the particular contours of a compelling state interest arise from a discrete factual context. Here, the Court has followed traditional summary judgment jurisprudence and drawn all reasonable inferences from the undisputed facts in *favor* of the City, ruling nevertheless that the City's proffer as to operational needs falls short.

Even had the proffer presented a closer question, however, it is important to note that this Court would nevertheless proceed itself to evaluate the situation and initially make the determination whether the operational needs of the Department constitute a compelling state interest. Such a determination involves a consideration of what are known as "legislative facts" -- those facts which themselves determine the legal rule, rather than "adjudicative facts" -- those facts which determine whether an established legal rule applies in a particular instance. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 201(a) advisory committee's note (distinguishing legislative from adjudicative facts). As such, this determination is one for the Court to make, not the jury. *Id.* ("In determining the content or applicability of a rule of domestic law, the judge is unrestricted in

The City's argument rests on the cynical assumption that members of a particular race will only cooperate with members of their own race. Commissioner Evans's report suggests that only when a sufficient number of minorities are on the police force will certain communities "be willing to work with us, rather than against us." Evans Decl. Ex. A, at 13. Such a policy invites the emergence of a divisive kind of racial politics between communities and the Department, as members of any race might threaten not to cooperate with the Department unless they see representation within the Department roughly proportional to that racial group's percentage of the population of Boston generally. *Cf. Wittmer*, 87 F.3d at 920 (rejecting contention that "prison authorities are entitled to yield to extortionate demands from prisoners for guards of their own race"). This kind of divisiveness, fostered by divvying up government benefits along racial lines, is what cases interpreting the Equal Protection seek to avoid. *E.g., Croson*, 488 U.S. at 493 (expressing concern that non-remedial racial classifications will "lead to a politics of racial hostility").

Additionally, the policy sends a message to officers within the Department that they are nothing more than a product of

---

his investigation and conclusion. He may reject the propositions of either party or of both parties. He may consult the sources of pertinent data to which they refer, or he may refuse to do so. He may make an independent search for persuasive data or rest content with what he has or what the parties present. . . . The parties do no more than assist; they control no part of the process." (quoting Edmund M. Morgan, *Judicial Notice*, 57 Harv. L. Rev. 269, 270-71 (1944)). Such an approach, of course, carries with it the benefit of plenary review by higher courts. *Wessmann*, 160 F.3d at 795.

their race. It relies upon crude stereotypes about how members of the same race act around one another, and how they act around members of other races. It suggests that the valued unit of measurement in the Boston Police Department is the group, rather than the individual. These are impermissible considerations for a government body to entertain. *E.g., Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 912, 132 L. Ed. 2d 762, 115 S. Ct. 2475 (1995) ("Race-based [decision making] embodies stereotypes that treat individuals as the product of their race, evaluating their thoughts and efforts--their very worth as citizens--according to a criterion barred to the Government by history and the Constitution.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

Finally, there is no logical stopping point to the Department's justification. Presumably, the Department will always have an interest in having a diverse police force to serve a diverse community. Therefore, there will always be an incentive for the Department to take account of race if such a justification is held to be compelling, to make sure that the racial makeup of the Department matches the racial makeup of the City. This is an unconstitutional end for a government policy. *E.g., Wittmer*, 87 F.3d at 920 (rejecting proposition that government "would have been entitled to take steps to make the racial composition of the security staff mirror that of the inmate population."). All the Department would have to show is that diversity within the Department continues to lead to police-community cooperation, and it would be given carte blanche to continue making race-based decisions. It would permit race-conscious remedies that are "ageless in their reach into the past, and timeless in their ability to affect the future." *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 276. This justification thus offends the principle that, because remedies for equal

protection violations usually involve treating people unequally, such remedies should be limited in scope and in duration. *See Croson*, 488 U.S. at 498. Because the operational needs justification has no such built-in limitation, it could be used to justify race-conscious decision making indefinitely, which has in the past been the reason why other proffered interests have been rejected by the Supreme Court. *See Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 275-76 (rejecting the role model theory and societal discrimination as compelling interests for this reason).

For these reasons, the Court rejects the City's "operational needs" defense as a compelling justification for its admittedly race-conscious action.[9]

---

[9] At a hearing on January 10, 2002, the Court suggested that another reason to reject the City's interest in effectuating its operational needs was a provision of the Massachusetts General Laws prohibiting unfair treatment within the state civil service on the basis of race. Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 1. The Court recognizes that if "operational needs" is a compelling interest in the constitutional sense, state law concerns would be irrelevant, as the Department's duty to comply with the federal Constitution would conflict with, and thus preempt, the state law obligation to assure fair treatment without regard to race. *See, e.g., Bowe v. Sec'y of the Commonwealth*, 320 Mass. 230, 245, 69 N.E.2d 115 (1946) ("When one party relies on some provision of a statute, and the other relies on some provision of the higher law of the Constitution, with which . . . the statute conflicts, . . . [the court's] duty is to apply the higher law of the Constitution, and disregard the statute."). Because the government has a clear duty to remedy vestiges of past discrimination, *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277, for example, such a duty overrides state law concerns regarding unfair treatment on the basis of race within the civil service.

b. Remedying Past Discrimination

The second interest proffered by the City and MAMLEO as a justification for the promotion decisions at issue is an interest in remedying current vestiges of past discrimination by the Department against black applicants and officers. City's Mem. at 14-17; MAMLEO's Mem. at 7-16. Well understanding that such an interest has been recognized by the Supreme Court as compelling under certain circumstances, *e.g.*, *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 909; *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277, the City and MAMLEO amass evidence, all of it uncontested by Plaintiffs, to show that remaining vestiges of prior discrimination perpetrated by the Department against blacks justify the limited race-conscious action taken by the Department in this case. After setting out the contours of remedying past discrimination as a compelling interest, the Court considers the undisputed evidence.

In order for a government interest in remedying past discrimination to rise to the level of a compelling justification for race-conscious action, two conditions must be satisfied: "First, . . . States . . . must identify that [past] discrimination

---

For the reasons outlined in this opinion, however, the Court rejects operational needs as a compelling interest on its own terms. Neither the Supreme Court nor the First Circuit has suggested that a government body has a constitutional mandate to further its own operational needs. In the absence of a clear directive from either of these courts to recognize such a mandate, it would be imprudent to create one out of whole cloth, particularly where it would contravene the clearly-articulated policy of the elected legislature of this Commonwealth to proscribe unfair treatment within the state civil service on the basis of race.

. . . with some specificity before they may use race-conscious relief. . . . Second, the institution that makes the racial distinction must have had a strong basis in evidence to conclude that remedial action was necessary, *before* it embarks on an affirmative-action program." *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 909 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

With respect to the first condition, the Court is satisfied that the City and MAMLEO have identified the past discrimination to be remedied with the appropriate degree of specificity. They identify the relevant past discrimination as that committed by the Boston Police Department, rather than, for example, discrimination in Boston generally or in police departments nationally, which would not satisfy the City's burden of showing that it had a "strong basis in evidence" for taking the action it did.

As to the second condition, the Court is satisfied preliminarily that the City concluded race-based action was necessary *before* it made the promotion decision. The Plaintiffs argue that the City never considered this rationale at the time of the decision, and should thus be barred from submitting this rationale now. *E.g.*, Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem at 6; Pls.' Mem. at 9 [Docket No. 124]. For the reasons set out in the Court's discussion of the City's operational needs argument, *see supra* pp. 32-34, the Court holds that the Department believed the challenged promotions were necessary to remedy past discrimination before it made the decisions. Even if the Court is wrong as matter of undisputed fact, however, as matter of law the City's interest in complying with EEOC guidelines and state and federal discrimination law, which it clearly articulated at the time it

made the promotion decisions, Am. Compl. Ex. B, permissibly implicates the City's interest in remedying past discrimination. In *Boston Police Superior Officers Federation v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998), the First Circuit rejected an argument identical to the one made here by the Plaintiffs. The court in Superior Officers dubbed "untenable" plaintiffs' argument that, because Commissioner Evans justified race-conscious action as necessary to comply with a consent decree then thought to be in force, he was not also acting to remedy past discrimination within the Department. 147 F.3d at 23. The First Circuit stated that "[compliance with the consent decree] so much implicates [remedying past discrimination] that Commissioner Evans, who stated in his affidavit that he was concerned with avoiding adverse impact on minority candidates, was undoubtedly pursuing both goals at once." *Id.*

The important question here is whether the Department had a "strong basis in evidence" for its belief that race-conscious action was necessary. *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 909 (quoting *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277). Such a strong basis in evidence may be demonstrated by "either 'a contemporaneous or antecedent finding of past discrimination by a court or other competent body,' or evidence 'approaching a prima facie case of a constitutional or statutory violation.'" *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 20 (quoting *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 289, and *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 500). The City and MAMLEO rely on a combination of both, and submit that judicial determinations of discrimination by the Department in hiring and promoting blacks, combined with the adverse impact of the 1996 exam, establish the requisite strong basis in evidence to take race-based action to remedy such discrimination.

Before delving into the evidence submitted by the City and MAMLEO on this point, the Court resolves one more legal dispute. The Plaintiffs assert repeatedly that the City may not rely on "after-acquired" evidence to demonstrate the existence of past discrimination or adverse impact. *E.g.*, Pls.' Opp'n to MAMLEO's Mem. at 5 [Docket No. 113]; Pls.' Mem. at 4-5. To say that the particular interest articulated by the government must have been actually considered at the time the government made its decision, *see supra* pp. 31-32, is not to say that the government must have made findings that it actually discriminated prior to its decision to engage in race-conscious action. The former is a principle recognized by the Supreme Court; the latter is a principle expressly rejected by the Supreme Court. In Justice O'Connor's concurring opinion in *Wygant*, for example, she endorsed the holding of a plurality of the Court that "a contemporaneous or antecedent finding of past discrimination by a court or other competent body is not a constitutional prerequisite to a public employer's voluntary agreement to an affirmative action plan." 476 U.S. at 289 (O'Connor, J., concurring). The rationale for this principle is simple: if the government was required to develop statistical or other detailed evidence that it engaged in discrimination against blacks, for example, before it engaged in affirmative action designed to enhance opportunities previously denied to blacks, there would be no incentive for the government to take affirmative action, because to do so would require the government to expose itself to liability to the very individuals it is trying to help. *Id.* at 290. This principle recognizes the delicate position of public employers, who are "trapped between the competing hazards of liability to minorities if affirmative action is not taken to remedy apparent employment discrimination and liability to nonminorities if affirmative action is taken." *Id.* at 291.

Somewhere, then, between merely articulating an interest in remedying past discrimination and garnering enough evidence to make out a winning case of discrimination against itself, the government satisfies its burden of demonstrating that it had a "strong basis in evidence" for concluding that past discrimination warranted a race-based remedy. Once again, Justice O'Connor provides useful guidance for where exactly that somewhere might be in a case like this:

> Demonstrable evidence of a disparity between the percentage of qualified blacks on a school's teaching staff and the percentage of qualified minorities in the relevant labor pool sufficient to support a prima facie Title VII pattern or practice claim by minority teachers would lend a compelling basis for a competent authority such as the School Board to conclude that implementation of a voluntary affirmative action plan is appropriate to remedy apparent prior employment discrimination.

Id. at 292.

In making this showing, the government may rely on statistical or other evidence developed after it engaged in race-conscious action to bolster its claim that vestiges of past discrimination remained within the government body. *E.g., Eng'g Contractors Ass'n of S. Fla., Inc. v. Metro. Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895, 911-13 (11th Cir. 1997); *Contractors Ass'n of E. Pa., Inc. v. City of Philadelphia*, 91 F.3d 586, 605 n.21 (3d Cir. 1996); *Concrete Works of Colo., Inc. v. City & County of Denver*, 36 F.3d 1513, 1520-21 (10th Cir. 1994); *Harrison & Burrowes Bridge Constructors, Inc. v.*

Cuomo, 981 F.2d 50, 60 (2d Cir. 1992); *Coral Constr. Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910, 919-20 (9th Cir. 1991). In this case, as long as the Department had the requisite "strong basis in evidence" for believing that the promotion decision was necessary to remedy present vestiges of past discrimination within the Department, it may rely on evidence developed after the promotion was made to buttress such a claim during litigation. *Rothe Dev. Corp. v. United States Dep't of Defense*, 262 F.3d 1306, 1328 n.21 (Fed. Cir. 2001). With these legal principles in mind, the Court turns to the evidence of past discrimination within the Department.

The Court begins by taking notice of the many opinions of the First Circuit documenting the discrimination perpetrated in the past by the Boston Police Department against minorities.[10] Particularly instructive is the First Circuit's most recent examination of the state of affairs within the Department in *Boston Superior Officers Federation v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998). In *Superior Officers*, the First Circuit held that the Boston Police Department's decision to promote a black officer named Rafael Ruiz to the rank of lieutenant, even though Ruiz scored one point lower on a civil service exam than did three white officers who were not promoted, was justified by an interest in remedying past

---

[10] A federal district court may take judicial notices of adjudicative facts "at any stage" of litigation, in its own discretion, where the facts are "capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201. The facts to be noticed are contained within the pages of the *Federal Reporter*, and their accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. Should the Plaintiffs choose to challenge the Court's exercise of discretion in this regard, however, they may do so. *Id.*

discrimination within the Department. In so holding, the court noted:

> The Department's history of racial discrimination is well-documented in the decisions of this court. In 1972, we affirmed a district court's finding that the BPD discriminated against black applicants through the use of entry-level testing procedures that favored whites. *Castro v. Beecher*, 459 F.2d 725 (1st Cir. 1972). As we noted in *Castro*, that discrimination resulted in a gross racial disparity among the Department's ranks: in 1970, only two percent of [Department] officers were black or Latino; by comparison, these groups constituted 16 percent of the general population.
>
> Nineteen years after *Castro*, this court in *Stuart [v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446 (1st Cir. 1991) again considered the evidence of past racial discrimination within the [Department] . . . and saw little evidence of remedying the discrimination cited in *Castro*. . . . 'Remedial action takes time,' we reasoned, 'and discrimination may linger for many years in an organization that had excluded blacks from its ranks.'
>
> The same logic dictates that the Department's historic discrimination negatively affected the number of black lieutenants at the time of Ruiz's promotion.

Id., 147 F.3d at 20 (some citations omitted).

The Plaintiffs dispute the precedential force of *Superior Officers*, arguing that the case stands for the proposition that the Department is barred from relying upon its history of past discrimination to justify post-*Superior Officers* race-conscious promotions. *E.g.*, Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 12-13, 15; Pls' Opp'n to MAMLEO's Mem. at 4-5. The Plaintiffs rely on the court's statement in *Superior Officers* that its holding "is based strictly on the[] unique circumstances [of this case], and does not give the [Department] license to depart from strict rank order in future promotions." 147 F.3d at 25.

The Plaintiffs attempt to wring more from the words of *Superior Officers* than they will bear. To be sure, the First Circuit did suggest that the Department may not rely on its discriminatory past to justify affirmative action indefinitely. But to say that *Superior Officers* does not give the Department license to depart from strict rank order in the future does not mean that the case prohibits the Department from ever considering race in the future. In fact, as to the question whether the Department may depart from strict rank order in future rounds of promotions, the court in *Superior Officers* explicitly reserved judgment. *Id.* at 25 ("Whether any similar factors are left that might warrant future remedial action is a question that we need not now address.").

Superior Officers is useful principally for its documentation of the past discriminatory history of the Department, which the First Circuit held was not "too temporally remote" to constitute part of the Department's evidentiary basis for concluding that race-conscious action was needed, *id.* at 20. The questions whether the Department

had a strong basis in evidence for concluding that *present vestiges* of past discrimination remain that required a race-conscious remedy, and whether the Department's remedy was *narrowly tailored* to the interest asserted, are questions that the Department must answer anew in this case, and must answer anew in every case, to ensure that the Department refrains from using race in an open-ended way indefinitely.

The Court now turns to the evidence presented by the City and MAMLEO that current vestiges of past discrimination existed in the 1996 exam that warranted a race-based solution. It is undisputed in this case that, had the Department promoted only 30 officers in strict rank order, 29 white officers and one black officer would have been promoted. Callahan Aff. ¶¶ 9, 11. Based on the number of black and non-black officers who passed the 1996 exam -- 33 and 192, respectively -- the Department calculated at the time it made the promotion decisions that promoting 30 officers in strict rank order would yield a black/non-black selection percentage ratio of 20%. *Id.* ¶ 11 & Ex. B. According to the EEOC Guidelines "four-fifths" rule, a selection percentage ratio below 80%, or four-fifths is evidence of adverse impact.[11]

---

[11] The Plaintiffs assert that the First Circuit in *Superior Officers* held that, because the consent decree between the Department and MAMLEO which required compliance with the four-fifths had expired, the four-fifths rule is no longer relevant to the determination of past discrimination. Pls.' Opp'n to MAMLEO's Mem. at 6-7. To the contrary, the First Circuit, despite holding that the Department was no longer bound by the consent decree, observed that although violation of the four-fifths rule, "standing alone, is not conclusive evidence of discrimination . . . [the rule] can . . . properly serve 'as a benchmark against

The Department had evidence, based on calculations it performed at the time it made the promotion decisions, Callahan Aff. ¶ 11, that proceeding in strict rank order would have produced a black/non-black selection ratio that fell well

---

which . . . to gauge [the City's] efforts to remedy past discrimination.'" *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 21 (quoting *Local 28, Sheet Metal Workers' International Ass'n v. EEOC*, 478 U.S. 421, 478, 92 L. Ed. 2d 344, 106 S. Ct. 3019 (1986)); *see also Albemarle Paper Co. v. Moody*, 422 U.S. 405, 431, 45 L. Ed. 2d 280, 95 S. Ct. 2362 (stating that EEOC Guidelines, as this administrative interpretation of Title VII by the EEOC, are entitled to "great deference").

There are instances, particularly where the sample size is small, where use of the four-fifths rule is inappropriate. *Fudge v. City of Providence Fire Dep't*, 766 F.2d 650, 658 n.10 (1st Cir. 1985). This concern obtains only when the sample size is so small that a change in a single promotion decision -- i.e., the decision to promote one more black officer and one fewer white officer -- makes the difference between adverse impact and no adverse impact under the four-fifths rule. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 22 (distinguishing *Fudge*). In this case, as in *Superior Officers*, the sample size is sufficiently large that the four-fifths rule may serve as an appropriate benchmark against which to gauge adverse impact. *See* Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 14 P 25 (Expert Report of James Medoff) (calculating that a single promotion change would not have made the difference between adverse impact and no adverse impact under the rule); Callahan Aff. Ex. B (same).

Because this is not a case in which the sample size is too small to make four-fifths rule calculations unreliable, the Court looks to the rule in the same way the First Circuit did in *Superior Officers*: as a helpful but not dispositive benchmark for determining adverse impact.

below the 80% ratio required to avoid an inference of adverse impact.

This gross statistical disparity between the selection percentage of black officers and the selection percentage of white officers, coupled with the documented history of past discrimination within the Department, created an adequate foundation for the Department to conclude that a departure from strict rank order was necessary. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 21 (stating that a violation of the four-fifths rule along with statistical evidence of underrepresentation of blacks at the lieutenant level, "reinforces the [Department's] conclusion that it had not yet succeeded in remedying the effects of its history of discrimination"). While this evidence might not alone have amounted to a winning Title VII case against the City by MAMLEO or minority officers, it would have presented enough evidence to make the prospect of losing a worthwhile concern for the City.[12]

---

[12] It is necessary at this point to explain why the violation of the four-fifths rule results in a potentially meritorious Title VII claim. Under Title VII, an employment selection procedure that adversely affects minorities can lead to employer liability if it can be shown that an alternative selection procedure existed that yielded qualified applicants while resulting in less adverse impact on minorities. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(k); *Albermarle Paper Co. v. Moody*, 422 U.S. at 431, 45 L. Ed. 2d 280, 95 S. Ct. 2362 (1975) ("Discriminatory tests are impermissible unless shown, by professionally acceptable methods, to be predictive of or significantly correlated with important elements of work behavior which comprise or are relevant to the job or jobs for which candidates are being evaluated.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

A prima facie Title VII adverse impact claim against an employer may be demonstrated in a number of ways. The Supreme Court has stated that a showing of "gross statistical disparities" between selection of minorities and non-minorities may alone indicate adverse impact. *Hazelwood Sch. Dist. v. United States*, 433 U.S. 299, 307-08, 53 L. Ed. 2d 768, 97 S. Ct. 2736 (1977). A violation of the four-fifths rule, even though it is generally considered a "rule of thumb," may demonstrate adverse impact, particularly when coupled with other statistical evidence of adverse impact. *See generally Watson v. Fort Worth Bank & Trust*, 487 U.S. 977, 995 n.3, 101 L. Ed. 2d 827, 108 S. Ct. 2777 (1988) (outlining ways in which adverse impact may be demonstrated, and declining to adopt any particular method as authoritative, approving instead of courts' case-by-case approach to determining adverse impact).

Once adverse impact is established, the burden of production shifts to the employer to show that the test has a "manifest relationship to the employment in question." *Albermarle Paper*, 422 U.S. at 425 (quoting *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. 424, 432, 28 L. Ed. 2d 158, 91 S. Ct. 849 (1977)). This includes a showing not only that the test validly distinguishes *between* passing and failing scores in terms of applicants' qualifications for the job in question, but also *among* passing scores, if the test is to be coupled with strict rank-order selection from the list of passing scores. *E.g., Guardians Ass'n v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 630 F.2d 79, 100-01 (2d Cir. 1980) ("Permissible use of rank-ordering requires a demonstration of such substantial test validity that it is reasonable to expect one-or two-point differences in scores to reflect differences in job performance."). Because the 1996 exam was never content-validated, the City could not show, at least as the evidence currently stands, that the 1996 exam validly distinguished between passing and failing scores, much less among passing scores. Thus, had the City proceeded in rank order and been sued

by MAMLEO or minority officers, it is quite possible that the City would have failed to meet its burden of production at this stage of the case, and would have thus been found to have violated Title VII.

Even if the City succeeded in showing that the test bore a close relationship to the skills sought in prospective sergeants, the would-be plaintiffs could still prevail by showing that other selection methods which have less adverse impact on minorities nonetheless meet the employer's objective of obtaining a qualified workforce. *E.g., Albermarle Paper*, 422 U.S. at 425. In such a case, the employer's failure to adopt the equally valid selection method that resulted in less adverse impact on minorities would be evidence that the employer's articulated reasons for relying upon the test are a pretext for discrimination. *Id.*

In this case, MAMLEO asserts that it has in the past recommended "banding" of test results -- i.e., treating scores within a given range (such as 84 to 86) as functionally equivalent for purposes of selecting among candidates -- as an equally valid method of selecting among candidates that has less adverse impact on minorities. MAMLEO's Mem. at 14. Banding has been approved by a number of courts. *E.g., Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 24 n.5; *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 979 F.2d 721, 723-24 (9th Cir. 1992); *Bridgeport Guardians, Inc. v. City of Bridgeport*, 933 F.2d 1140, 1144 (2d Cir. 1991). Had the Department rejected such a proposal after it was found to reduce adverse impact while still yielding qualified candidates for promotion, the Department would have faced a very real prospect of liability under Title VII for using an employment practice that adversely impacted minorities.

Therefore, when the Department learned that its proposed promotion scheme of hiring 30 officers in strict rank order resulted

This evidence therefore constituted an adequate starting point for the Department to conclude, at the time it made the promotion decisions, that current vestiges of past discrimination remained and warranted remedial action.

But this is not the only evidence upon which the City and MAMLEO rely. In addition to a violation of the four-fifths rule, MAMLEO submits the expert reports of Dr. Kathleen K. Lundquist, an industrial psychologist who studied the adverse impact of the 1996 exam in preparation for this litigation. Her reports show that the 1996 exam adversely impacted blacks vis-a-vis non-blacks, and that the difference between the black selection percentage and the non-black selection percentage is statistically significant under two different measures of statistical significance -- "chi-square" and "Fisher's Exact Test".[13] Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 15 ¶¶ 9-14

---

in a black/non-black selection percentage ratio of 20%, well below the 80% rule of thumb set by the four-fifths rule, it had a sufficient evidentiary basis, in light of the Department's past discrimination against blacks, to take remedial action.

[13] A "chi-square" statistic indicates as a percentage the likelihood that the difference between two measures -- in this case, between the selection percentages of blacks and non-blacks -- is attributable to chance. A chi-square statistic of less than five percent is considered to indicate statistical significance, or that the difference between the two measures is attributable to something other than chance. A "Fisher's Exact Test" value expresses differences between two measures in terms of standard deviation units. A Fisher's Exact Test value of 2.00 or greater is generally considered to indicate statistical significance. Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 15 ¶ 8. Under both of these tests, the adverse impact of the 1996 exam on blacks vis-a-vis non-blacks was found to be highly

& tabs 1-3 (Expert Report of Kathleen K. Lundquist). Rutkowski Supp. Aff. Ex. A ¶¶ 10, 13-14 (Supplemental Expert Report of Kathleen K. Lundquist) [Docket No. 133]. These calculations bolster the inference raised by violation of the four-fifths rule that the 1996 exam adversely impacted black officers.

The City also submits the report of Dr. James Medoff, a professor of labor economics at Harvard University. Dr. Medoff reports on the state of black representation at the rank of sergeant relative to black representation at the officer level. He states that, as of October 1996, 25.02% of the 1547 police officers within the Department were black, but only 16.49% of the 285 sergeants were black. Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 14 ¶ 14 & tbl.1 (Expert Report of James Medoff). This difference is statistically significant using a chi-square statistic. *Id.* The gap diminishes, but remains, when officers not eligible for promotion by virtue of not having served long enough on the force are excluded from the calculation. *Id.* ¶ 15 & tbl.2. The court in *Superior Officers* found similar evidence relevant to the question whether the Department had remedied past discrimination adequately, and held that the paucity of black officers at the lieutenant level reinforced the Department's evidentiary foundation for its race-conscious action. 147 F.3d at 21.

The Court is therefore satisfied from this undisputed evidence that the City has satisfied its burden of showing that the Department had a "strong basis in evidence" for taking remedial action. *See Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 292 (O'Connor, J.,

---

statistically significant. *Id.*

concurring) (suggesting that "demonstrable evidence of a disparity" between the percentage of minorities in a government position and the percentage of qualified minorities in the relevant labor pool "sufficient to support a prima facie Title VII pattern or practice claim" by minorities would constitute a strong basis in evidence for remedial action); *cf. Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 908 n.4 (assuming that a state has a compelling interest in complying with the Voting Rights Act, but only when the government has a "strong basis in evidence for believing that it is violating the Act") (citations omitted). The Court holds that, in this case, the City's interest in remedying past discrimination is supported by a sufficiently substantial evidentiary basis that it rises to the level of a compelling state interest.

c. Avoiding Litigation

The third justification submitted in support of the Department's promotion decisions is the Department's interest in avoiding litigation that it asserts would have followed inexorably from its failure to promote more than one black officer to the rank of sergeant. City's Mem. at 17-18; Evans Aff. ¶¶ 6, 10-11. In support of its argument, the City relies upon *Superior Officers*, where the First Circuit stated that the motivation of "heading off a potential discrimination claim--would be [a] lawful" justification for race-conscious action. 147 F.3d at 23.

To say that the desire to avoid litigation is a *lawful* objective does not necessarily make it a *compelling* objective in the constitutional sense. The cases upon which the First Circuit in *Superior* Officers and the City rely involve Title VII claims brought by disgruntled employees as a result of an

employer's decision to promote a member of another race or gender in order to fulfill a pre-existing settlement agreement or consent decree between the employer and the promoted individual. *Marcantel v. La. Dep't of Transp. & Dev.*, 37 F.3d 197, 198 (5th Cir. 1994); *Carey v. United States Postal Serv.*, 812 F.2d 621, 622-23 (10th Cir. 1987); *EEOC v. McCall Printing Corp.*, 633 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (6th Cir. 1980). These cases stand only for the proposition that when an employer hires or promotes an individual on the basis of race or gender in order to fulfill a pre-existing settlement agreement or consent decree with that individual, the employment decision does not constitute unlawful discrimination against others who were not a part of the settlement agreement or consent decree. *Mercantel*, 37 F.3d at 201; *Carey*, 812 F.2d at 624; *McCall Printing*, 633 F.2d at 1237.

Here, there was no consent decree in force between the Department and the Black Officers that required them to be promoted to sergeant at the next available opportunity. The interest articulated by the City in this case is much more ephemeral: it is a belief that, even though no consent decree existed between the Department and MAMLEO or the Black Officers, there was the prospect of a Title VII suit brought by one of these parties had the Department promoted in strict rank order.

The general assertion of an interest in avoiding litigation, without more, "sweeps too broadly" to be a compelling state interest in all circumstances. *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 908 n.4. Certainly there cannot be a compelling state interest in "avoiding meritless lawsuits." *Id.; see also id.* at 943 n.18 (Stevens, J., dissenting) ("The majority is surely correct in

stating that the threat of a lawsuit, however unlikely to succeed, does not constitute a compelling interest . . . ."). Thus, this Court does not read the language of the First Circuit in *Superior Officers* to mean that a conclusory assertion by a defendant that failing to act in a race-based way would have invited litigation suffices to establish a compelling interest.

Instead, the proper way to analyze an articulated interest in averting a lawsuit under strict scrutiny is the same as an articulated interest in remedying past discrimination: the interest is compelling only if a defendant has a "strong basis in evidence" for believing it violated the relevant law that would have brought about the feared lawsuit. *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. at 908 n.4. In this case, only if the Department had a strong basis in evidence for believing it violated Title VII would the City's interest in avoiding a lawsuit predicated on a violation of Title VII rise to the level of a compelling interest.

The analysis here is thus entirely duplicative of the Court's consideration of the City's interest in remedying past discrimination, *see supra* Part IV.B.1.b & note 12, and the Court will not repeat it. Although the City cannot get by with a bald assertion that a lawsuit would have followed from proceeding in strict rank order, together with MAMLEO it has shown here that a meritorious Title VII action was likely given the solid evidence of the disparate impact of the 1996 exam, the history of discrimination within the Department, and the close watch kept by MAMLEO over all hiring and promotion decisions made by the Department. The Court holds this interest to be compelling based on the undisputed facts of this case.

2. Narrow Tailoring

The City and MAMLEO assert that the promotion decisions at issue were narrowly tailored -- as they must be under a strict scrutiny analysis -- to further the compelling interests set out above. The Plaintiffs, not surprisingly, contest this conclusion. Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 17-19; Pls.' Opp'n to MAMLEO's Mem. at 9-10. It is for this Court to determine, by applying the law to the undisputed facts as presented by the parties, whether the Department's promotion decisions were narrowly tailored. *See, e.g., United States v. Sec'y of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 239 F.3d 211, 219 n.12 (2d Cir. 2001) ("A district court's determination that a race-conscious remedy is narrowly tailored to advance a compelling government interest involves an application of law to facts . . . ."); *Eng'g Contractors Ass'n of S. Fla., Inc. v. Metro. Dade County*, 122 F.3d at 905 (11th Cir. 1997) ("After identifying the factual predicate for the affirmative action program in question, the district court makes a legal determination about whether the program's terms are sufficiently tied to its legitimate goals to pass constitutional muster."). Before addressing the dispute between the parties, the Court maps out the legal landscape upon which narrow tailoring battles are fought.

The Supreme Court and the First Circuit have provided several criteria to direct lower courts in evaluating race-conscious policies. The Supreme Court has stated that factors to be considered include "the necessity for the relief and the efficacy of alternative remedies; the flexibility and duration of the relief . . . and the impact of the relief on the rights of third parties." *United States v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 171, 94 L. Ed. 2d 203, 107 S. Ct. 1053 (1987) (plurality opinion).

The First Circuit provided further guidance in *Mackin v. City of Boston*, 969 F.2d 1273 (1st Cir. 1992), where it stated that relevant narrow tailoring factors include:

> The extent to which (i) the beneficiaries of the order are specially advantaged, (ii) the legitimate expectancies of others are frustrated or encumbered, (iii) the order interferes with other valid state or local policies, and (iv) the order contains (or fails to contain) built-in mechanisms which will, if time and events warrant, shrink its scope and limit its duration.

Id. at 1278; see also *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 23-25 (applying *Mackin* factors and holding that promotion of one Hispanic officer to the rank of lieutenant out of rank order was narrowly tailored to remedying past discrimination committed by the Department). The Court analyzes the Department's promotion decisions using these factors.

The first consideration under narrow tailoring is "the necessity for the relief and the efficacy of race-neutral alternatives." *Paradise*, 480 U.S. at 171. It is clear in this case that *some* kind of relief was necessary, in light of the fact that promoting 30 officers in strict rank order as the Department originally planned would have adversely impacted black officers and exposed the Department to suit from those officers or from MAMLEO, which closely reviewed the Department's actions. *See supra* Part IV.B.1.b & note 12; Callahan Aff. ¶¶ 9-11; Evans Aff. ¶¶ 4-11. The Department's response was to promote only enough black officers to bring it into compliance with the four-fifths rule and avoid an inference of adverse impact. *See* Callahan Aff. Ex. B

(comparing black/non-black selection percentage ratios for four different promotion arrangements). According to Dr. Kathleen Lundquist, the approach taken by the Department represented the alternative that had the least adverse impact on white officers, with the exception of an approach proposed by the Department that was rejected by the Division. Rutkowski Aff. Ex. 15 ¶¶ 13-14 & tab 3. This undisputed evidence suggests that the Department did what was necessary, and no more, to correct the adverse impact of the 1996 exam.

As to the efficacy of race-neutral alternatives, this case is slightly different from *Superior Officers*, where there was "no suggestion that any race-neutral measure would have been adequate to remedy the Department's past discrimination." 147 F.3d at 25. Here, the Plaintiffs argue that at least two possibilities -- adding an oral interview component to a candidate's promotion score in order to mitigate the adverse impact of the 1996 exam, and adding an "assessment center"[14] component to a candidate's promotion score -- could have been implemented by the Department to avoid adverse impact in a less race-conscious way. Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 18.

---

[14] An "assessment center" is a test or simulation designed to examine how well a candidate fulfills a certain skill set required of the job sought. As Commissioner Evans explained, "there can be assessment centers that will access [sic] how an individual handles paperwork. There can be assessment centers where an individual will be given a scenario in how he would respond in the scenario." Freidel Aff. Ex. 2, at 7 (Deposition of Paul F. Evans, day two).

The Court is not sure that these alternatives would even have been feasible alternatives to the promotion decisions made by the Department. The Department learned of the adverse impact of the 1996 exam only after it received a certified list of passing scores from the Division. Callahan Aff. ¶¶ 8-9, 11. It is doubtful that the Department would have been at liberty, at that late stage, to scrap the 1996 exam altogether and add new components, such as an oral interview, to the process by which it chose new sergeants.

The Court is quite sure, however, that these alternatives would have been much more cumbersome and much less certain to achieve remediation of the adverse impact of the 1996 exam than the promotion decisions that were ultimately made. Edward Callahan testified at a deposition that the reason oral interviews were omitted from the 1996 exam was because "the expense was enormous," and because such interviews did not successfully avert litigation. Callahan Dep. at 119 (dated Sept. 21, 2000). Although similar observations about "assessment centers" are not readily apparent from the record, it is reasonable to assume that such tests -- simulations of real-world sergeant duties -- would be similarly costly, and would not necessarily yield as immediate a reduction in adverse impact as did the promotion decisions at issue in this litigation.

The next consideration in narrow tailoring analysis is the extent to which "the beneficiaries of the [race-based decision] are specially advantaged." *Mackin*, 969 F.2d at 1278. In *Superior Officers*, the First Circuit applied this facet of narrow tailoring:

> Ruiz . . . was not "specially," or unfairly benefitted by his promotion. Ruiz's performance on the 1992 exam was not only passing, but only one point shy of that of the candidates bypassed for his promotion. In *Stuart [v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446, 449 (1st Cir. 1991), by comparison, we approved the remedial promotion of candidates from below the "certification" cut-off of "2n + 1" candidates, a far greater gap in scores.

147 F.3d at 24. Here, there was no gap between the Black Officers and the Plaintiffs in test score. If the beneficiary of the race-conscious action in *Superior Officers* was found not to have been unfairly rewarded by the promotion decision, then *a fortiori* the Black Officers in this case, who scored identically on the 1996 exam to the Plaintiffs, have not been unfairly benefitted.

Another important factor in the narrow tailoring equation is the degree to which the race-conscious action interferes with the rights, interests, and expectations of third parties. *Paradise*, 480 U.S. at 171; *Mackin*, 969 F.2d at 1278. In this case, the ten officers who also scored 84 but who were not promoted could arguably be said to have had their interests and expectations impaired by the promotion decisions. Several factors, however, mitigate the force of this argument. First, the burden borne here by the Plaintiffs lay in being passed over for promotion, rather than, for example, being laid off. The Supreme Court has recognized that "denial of a future employment opportunity is not as intrusive as loss of an existing job." *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 282-83. Second, in Massachusetts, civil servants do not have a property interest

in promotions. *Bielawski v. Personnel Adm'r of Div. of Personnel Admin.*, 422 Mass. 459, 466, 663 N.E.2d 821 (1996) (rejecting claim that civil servant had property interest in promotion "by virtue of his name appearing on the top of the certified list, his high score, or his expectations built up over years of long service"). Third, when a civil service exam results in a tie-score, and the appointing authority (in this case, the Department) promotes some but not all of the tied candidates, no actionable "bypass" has taken place in the parlance of the Civil Service Commission. Freidel Aff. Ex. 3, at IV(a) (Civil Serv. Comm'n, *A Guide to the Civil Service Process*) ("A bypass does not occur if one or more candidates have a tie score."); *id.* Exs. 4 & 5 (opinions of the Civil Service Commission dismissing appeals of two of the Plaintiffs in this case, William J. Dwan and William Knecht, respectively, because no bypass had taken place). Fourth, because "white officers passed over on one test may be considered for future appointments," *Stuart v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446, 454 (1st Cir. 1991), any interference with legitimate interests is likely to be temporary. As the Plaintiffs' counsel represents, the Plaintiffs will continue to seek promotion. Pls.' Opp'n to City's Mem. at 5. Indeed, three of the Plaintiffs, Michael P. Locke, William J. Dwan, and Thomas L. Sexton, have since been promoted to sergeant. Callahan Reply Aff. ¶¶ 3, 5-6 [Docket No. 143]. While the Plaintiffs' interest in being promoted to sergeant was certainly affected by the promotion decisions, the competitive nature of Department promotions, the absence of any legal expectancy in a promotion, and the temporary nature of the imposition suggest that this consideration does not seriously impugn the narrow tailoring of the promotion decisions.

The fourth consideration in narrow tailoring analysis is the degree to which the decision "interferes with other valid state or local policies." *Mackin*, 969 F.2d at 1278. In *Superior Officers*, the court held that the promotion of one Hispanic officer out of rank order did not interfere with state or local policies, because the promotion did not interfere with basic merit principles embodied in the state civil service law. 147 F.3d at 24 ("[Ruiz's] test score indicated that he and Plaintiffs shared virtually identical qualifications."). The court in *Superior Officers* may have given this consideration somewhat short shrift, as the promotion decision at issue in that case, along with the decisions here, certainly are questionable under the state civil service law definition of basic merit principles, which includes a guarantee of "fair treatment of all applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration without regard to . . . race." Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 1.[15]

The structure of the Massachusetts civil service law, however, suggests that the promotion decisions at issue here did not ultimately interfere with valid state policy. First, even though the civil service law guarantees "fair treatment" without regard to race, the Division allows appointing authorities like the Department to make bypasses on the basis of race. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court recognized this in *Massachusetts Ass'n of Minority Law Enforcement Officers v. Abban*, 434 Mass. 256, 748 N.E.2d 455 (2001), when it observed:

---

[15] The Court does not attempt to define precisely what the guarantee of "fair treatment" without regard to race means.

> The police department was not without options for pursuing its goals: Civil service law allows for special certifications based on race, color, national origin or sex. Personnel Administration Rules, PAR 10. . . . The analysis under Par 10 appeals is substantially similar to that of the strict scrutiny standard for protected classes under an equal protection claim.

Id. at 261 n.12 (internal quotation marks omitted). Massachusetts civil service law thus expressly allows for the consideration of race in making bypasses, so long as such a bypass would survive strict scrutiny. But in contrast to the promotions at issue in *Abban* and *Superior Officers*, the promotion decisions here involved no bypass. Freidel Aff. Ex. 3. As such, the Plaintiffs had no basis for appealing the decision of the Department to the Civil Service Commission. Id. Exs. 4 & 5. These two factors suggest that the promotion decisions here did not interfere with valid state policies embedded within the state civil service law.

The final consideration under narrow tailoring is the degree to which the policy or decision is limited in scope and duration. *Paradise*, 480 U.S. at 171; *Mackin*, 969 F.2d at 1278. Here, the decisions involved a one-time promotion of three officers to the rank of sergeant. The City and MAMLEO assert, and the Plaintiffs do not contest, that the 1996 exam has not again been used since the promotions at issue here, Callahan Aff. ¶ 16, that a new exam has replaced the 1996 exam, *id.* ¶ 17, and that all promotions since the ones at issue here have been made in strict rank order, except for bypasses for cause, Evans Aff. ¶ 13. The remedy for the

discriminatory impact of the 1996 exam thus appears to have ended as soon as the promotions were made, or at the latest when the Department abandoned the 1996 exam.

Based on the undisputed facts presented by the parties, the Court concludes that the Department's promotion decisions were narrowly tailored to remedy past discrimination and avoid a Title VII lawsuit.

The Court pauses here for a moment. In determining whether a remedy is limited in duration, courts are often left to rely on the representations of the government that such remedies are limited. In *Superior Officers*, the First Circuit observed that "both the [Department] and the [Division] have represented Ruiz's promotion as a one-time remedy." 147 F.3d at 25. Clearly it was not, otherwise this litigation would never have taken place. The representations made in *Superior Officers* have thus proved unsatisfactory, as this subsequent litigation predicated on the same wrong belies them.

This Court is therefore, unfortunately, left to do what the court in *Superior Officers* did: again warn the Department that this opinion should in no way be taken as carte blanche to engage in race-conscious action in the future. In each subsequent round of litigation, the Department must show not only that it has a strong basis in evidence for its conclusion that current vestiges of past discrimination remain and warrant a remedy, but also that the particular remedy chosen by the Department is narrowly tailored to further such an interest. As the Supreme Court has said:

> Because racial characteristics so seldom provide a relevant basis for disparate

> treatment, and because classifications based on race are potentially so harmful to the entire body politic, it is especially important that the reasons for any such classification be clearly identified and unquestionably legitimate . . . . Racial classifications are simply too pernicious to permit any but the most exact connection between justification and classification.

Adarand, 515 U.S. at 236 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted).

One warning should have been enough. In these circumstances, it is altogether fitting and proper to borrow a doctrine from the law of trusts and estates. The City, through its Police Department and Police Commissioner, embraces an essential public trust, vital to the functioning of a modern, heterogeneous, and vibrant urban metropolis -- the effective, even-handed enforcement of the laws to the end that public safety and domestic tranquility may be assured. Indeed, upon the proper discharge of this public trust depend all the other governmental functions of the City. At the same time, in the area of race relations, the Commissioner is between a rock and a hard place. The Commonwealth's civil service law eschews any form of affirmative action, yet the Commissioner believes that, on occasion, such race-conscious action furthers the direct operational needs of the Department. MAMLEO properly is alert to advance the interests of its members yet, if the Commissioner utilizes race as a criterion for hiring and promotion, those who consider themselves "white" are almost sure to sue. Then too, the overarching legal-factual matrix is fluid and evolving.

Where there are similarly difficult issues involving the interpretation of wills and trusts in light of changed circumstances, executors, administrators, and trustees are encouraged to petition the courts for instruction. *See, e.g., Hill v. Moors*, 224 Mass. 163, 165, 112 N.E. 641 (1916); Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 259 (1959); 3A Austin Wakeman Scott & William Franklin Fratcher, *The Law of Trusts* § 259 (4th ed. 1988); 4A *id.* § 394. The entire cy pres doctrine has grown out of such petitions. *See, e.g., Town of Milton v. Attorney Gen.*, 314 Mass. 234, 49 N.E.2d 909 (1943); *Jackson v. Phillips*, 96 Mass. (14 Allen) 539 (1867).

Such a procedure ought work well here, promptly adjudicating the rights of affected parties, subject to review, and providing clear guidance in difficult circumstances to the prime decision makers.

Accordingly, this Court will retain jurisdiction post judgment, and directs the City, whenever the Department seeks to use racial factors in hiring or promotion decisions,[16] to formulate its personnel decision and then petition the Court for instructions concerning whether such a racially motivated

---

[16] Nothing herein shall be read to require any such petition concerning the Commissioner's deployment of the Department's resources or in any respect assigning officers to particular duties. The Court appreciates the delicate position the Department is in with regard to these matters, *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 291 (O'Connor, J., concurring), and does not wish to intervene in the Department's affairs any more than is necessary to ensure the Department's compliance with the Constitution. This procedure is reserved solely for actual hiring or promotional decisions which the Department seeks to make on racial grounds.

decision passes constitutional muster. The Department shall so petition this Court both when it "reaches down" to hire or promote a lower-scoring individual on the basis of race, and when it picks among candidates who are tied on a civil service exam on the basis of race. On its part, the Court will give notice to all affected parties, including MAMLEO, and promptly will hold a hearing, entertain argument, and render a decision. Done properly, such a procedure ought further predictability, hold down the burgeoning legal costs of this sort of litigation, and, most important, further the general societal acceptance of the required nuanced balancing.

V. Conclusion

For the sake of clarity, the Court summarizes the substance of its decision:

1. The Plaintiffs have standing to litigate this case because, as a result of the Department's promotion decisions, they were denied an opportunity to compete on an equal footing with other officers on the basis of race.

2. The Plaintiffs have standing to pursue injunctive relief, as they face a real and immediate threat that their right to compete on an equal footing will be denied again in the future.

3. The Department took account of race in promoting the Black Officers who scored 84 on the 1996 exam, while declining to promote

the Plaintiffs, who also scored 84 and who are white.

4. The Department's promotion decisions are therefore subject to strict scrutiny, which requires that the decisions be supported by a compelling interest and that they be narrowly tailored to further that interest.

5. The Department's stated interest in effectuating its operational needs by maintaining a diverse workforce is not a compelling interest. It is too amorphous and too indefinite in scope and duration, and it risks engendering a politics of racial hostility within the Department and the City.

6. The Department's stated interests in remedying the current vestiges of past discrimination, and in avoiding a Title VII lawsuit, are compelling interests. On this record, the City has satisfied its evidentiary burden of demonstrating a "strong basis in evidence" for its claim that current vestiges of past discrimination remained within the Department, including the adverse impact of the 1996 exam that rendered the Department vulnerable to a meritorious Title VII suit by MAMLEO or minority officers, and warranted a race-conscious remedy.

7. The Department's promotion decisions were narrowly tailored to further these compelling

interests. The promotion decisions did no more than what was necessary to remedy current vestiges of past discrimination and avoid a lawsuit. The record shows no credible alternatives to the promotion decisions that would have been less race-conscious. The promotion decisions elevated three qualified officers to the rank of sergeant at the expense of ten officers, including the Plaintiffs, who, although qualified, had no right or entitlement to be promoted. The promotion decisions were a one-time remedy designed to solve a discrete yet serious harm, and to do so in as narrow a way as possible.

8. The City shall petition this Court for instructions when the Department in the future chooses to use racial factors in hiring and promotions.

For these reasons, the Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment [Docket No. 124] is DENIED, and the motions of MAMLEO and the City for summary judgment [Docket Nos. 87, 91] are ALLOWED. Judgment shall enter for the Defendants. The Court will retain jurisdiction as noted above.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ _____
WILLIAM G. YOUNG
CHIEF JUDGE

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 99-11101 WGY

[January 14, 2002]

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET ALS.	)
Plaintiffs	)
	)
v.	)
	)
CITY OF BOSTON, ET ALS.	)
Defendants	)
	)

PARTIAL JUDGMENT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 54 (b) - ORDER

Young, C.J.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 (b), this Court hereby enters an order for partial judgment against defendant James J. Hartnett Jr., in his official capacity as the Personnel Administrator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for attorney's fees of $47,180.51, in accordance with the *Stipulation of Facts and Legal Premises and Agreement for Declaratory Judgment*, dated December 21, 2001, between the plaintiffs and James J. Hartnett Jr., in his official capacity

as the Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through his successor and assign, Acting Personnel Administrator Patricia S. Wada ("Personnel Administrator"), filed with this Court on December 31, 2001.

This Court specifically excludes from the entry of this order the entry of any declaratory judgment, as proposed in the *Joint Motion for Entry of and Order for Declaratory Judgment* dated December 21, 2001, since the Court will not enter any declaration until such time as the Court determines that the entry of such a declaration is appropriate.

/s/ _____
WILLIAM G. YOUNG
CHIEF JUDGE

APPENDIX E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 99-11101-WGY

[October 20, 2002]

WINIFRED N. COTTER, VINCENT J. DIFAZIO, JOHN P. DORIS, WILLIAM J. DWAN, WILLIAM G. KNECHT, MICHAEL LOCKE, PATRICK L. MURPHY, and THOMAS L. SEXTON,
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF BOSTON and JAMES J. HARTNETT, JR.,
Defendant,

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YOUNG, C.J.

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1997, eleven City of Boston police officers earned a score of 84 on the civil service sergeant's exam, a certification test administered by the Commonwealth of

Massachusetts Human Resources Division (the "Division"). Eight of these officers were "white" (the "White Officers") and three were "black" (the "Black Officers").[1] When the Boston Police Department (the "Police Department") promoted only the Black Officers, the White Officers brought this action against the City of Boston (the "City") and James J. Hartnett, Jr. ("Hartnett"), in his official capacity as the Personnel Administrator of the Division. The White Officers allege civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, claiming that the City's decision was unlawfully motivated by race and Hartnett's office failed in its duty to prevent such discriminatory actions. Hartnett says, in effect, "Who? Me?" and moves to dismiss the White Officers' claims against him for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted because he neither made the promotion selections nor

---

[1] Although the parties use the terms "white" and "black" as though their meaning were self-evident, facile adoption of these stereotypes only compounds the issues the Court is asked to address. Racism is a persistent, intractable, and ugly fact of American life, *see e.g. United States v. Leviner*, 31 F. Supp. 2d 23, 33 (D. Mass. 1998) (Gertner, J.), and it is blind ignorance to declaim that the concept of "race" is nothing more than a social construct. Race matters. Just ask anyone who considers herself black. Still, the Court cannot help but observe that embedded in all governmental efforts to eradicate racism by direct governmental action are a myriad of untested assumptions about "race" that reinforce the coarsest type of racial stereo-typing. It is a conundrum. Perhaps the best that can be said here is that the plaintiff officers consider themselves "whit" and the City of Boston considers the officers initially appointed "black."

allegedly possessed legal authority under Massachusetts law to prevent selection among equally-scoring candidates.[2]

II. MOTION TO DISMISS STANDARD

Taking all facts and inferences drawn therefrom in favor of the White Officers, this Court must grant a motion to dismiss "if it clearly appears, according to the facts alleged, that the plaintiff[s] cannot recover on any viable theory." *Figueroa v. Rivera*, 147 F.3d 77, 80 (1st Cir. 1998). Despite this low threshold, the pleading requirement is "not entirely a toothless tiger." *Doyle v. Hasbro, Inc.*, 103 F.3d 186, 190 (1st Cir. 1996). In order to survive a motion to dismiss, the White Officers must set forth "factual allegations, either direct or inferential, respecting each material element necessary to sustain recovery. . . ." *Cooperman v. Individual, Inc.*, 171 F.3d 43, 47 (1st Cir. 1999). As such, the Court need not accept "bald assertions, unsupportable conclusions, periphrastic circumlocutions, and the like . . . ." *Rogan v. Menino*, 175 F.3d 75, 77 (1st Cir. 1999).

---

[2] The Division itself originally was named as a defendant and also made a motion to dismiss the complaint because, as a state agency, it is not a proper defendant in a federal civil rights lawsuit. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 105 L. Ed. 2d 45, 109 S. Ct. 2304 (1989). In their amended complaint, filed after the Division's motion to dismiss, the White Officers have dropped the Division as a defendant and, accordingly, its motion is moot.

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND DERIVED FROM THE AMENDED COMPLAINT

On October 19, 1996, the Division administered a certification exam for Boston police officers seeking a promotion to the rank of sergeant. *See* Am. Compl. ¶ 18. After scoring the exams, the Division provided the Police Department with a list of the 69 highest scorers arranged in alphabetical order by each score (ranging from 92 down to 82). *See id.*, Ex. A. The group with a score of 84 included both the White Officers and the Black Officers. *See id.* at ¶ 24. The Police Department eventually promoted a total of 36 individuals including the Black Officers. *See id.* at ¶ 38. The White Officers, despite the fact that they had the same score as the Black Officers, did not receive promotions. *See id.*, at ¶ 35.

Correspondence between Police Department officials and Hartnett's office reveal a concerted effort by the Police Department to promote the Black Officers because of their race. Most strikingly, the Police Department initially promoted the Black Officers to the exclusion of six "white" officers who had the higher score of 85.[3] *See id.*, at ¶ 37, Ex. B. In correspondence with the Division, the Police Department stated that this score bypass, referred to in the Amended Complaint as "reaching down," was effectuated "to ensure compliance with current EEOC guidelines, applicable federal and state discrimination laws," *id.*, and to prevent the percentage of "black" sergeants from dropping below 15.18%

---

[3] At the time of the examination, there were only 30 open sergeant positions.

of all sergeants,[4] *See id.*, Ex. C. In response, Hartnett's office informed the Police Department by letter that such reasons did not justify a bypass and were unacceptable.[5] *See id.*, Ex. D. To implement its desired promotion of the Black Officers in the face of Hartnett's apparent disapproval, the Police Department requested and obtained a Public Safety Civil Service Requisition for six sergeant vacancies in order to promote, in addition to the Black Officers, the "white" candidates who had been bypassed.[6] *See* Am. Compl. Ex. G. Despite the extensive dialogue between the Police Department and Hartnett's office, however, no mention was ever made of the fact that the Police Department eventually promoted the

---

[4] The Amended Complaint does not precisely indicate the importance of keeping minority representation above 15.18%. A fair inference reveals, however, that the statistical figure is related to a 1978 federal court consent decree that required the Police Department to "reach down" to select minority candidates until specific goals and timetables for promotion of black officers were met. The goals were met and the decree came to an end in 1995. *See generally Boston Police Superior Officers Fed'n v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13, 17 (1st Cir. 1998).

[5] The letter stated that the effort to keep the percentage of black sergeants above 15.18% was not acceptable "inasmuch as the consent decree with the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers (MAMLEO) is no longer in effect." Am. Compl., Ex. D.

[6] By increasing the total number of "white" officers promoted, of course, the percentage of "black" sergeants actually decreased to 14.4%, lower than the 15.18% figure that the Police Department was trying to avoid by "reaching down" in the first place. *See* Am. Compl. ¶ 45.

Black Officers scoring 84 to the exclusion of the eight White Officers with the same exam score.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. *Hartnett's Specific Obligations Under Civil Service Law*

As the Personnel Administrator of the Human Resources Division, Hartnett is charged with providing eligible lists (based on test scores) of individuals for jobs and promotions in the civil service. *See* Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 25 (1999). The "ultimate selection" for promotion of civil servants from such lists is left to the "broad" discretion of the appointing authority, in this case the Police Department. *Burns v. Sullivan*, 473 F. Supp. 626, 629 (D. Mass. 1979) (Caffrey, C.J.), *aff'd, 619 F.2d 99 (1st Cir. 1980)*. When, however, the Police Department awards a promotional appointment to an individual "other than the qualified person whose name appears highest" on the list, i.e., a "bypass," the Police Department must "immediately file with [Hartnett] a written statement of . . . reasons for appointing the person whose name was not highest." Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27 (1999). Hartnett has the power to accept or reject the reasons given by the Police Department for the bypass. *See MacHenry v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 40 Mass. App. Ct. 632, 635, 666 N.E.2d 1029 (1996); *Boston Police Dep't v. Campbell*, 1997 Mass. Super. LEXIS 285, No. CIV.A. 96-3674-*B, 1997 WL 426973,* at *1 (Mass. Super. 1997) (King, J.). Hartnett relied on this power of rejection when it prevented the Police Department's attempt to promote the Black Officers to the exclusion of "white" candidates with higher test scores.

Unlike statutory or regulatory regimes in other jurisdictions,[7] Massachusetts civil service law does not explicitly spell out Hartnett's responsibilities when an appointing authority makes a promotional selection among candidates with equal scores on an eligibility list.[8] Hartnett contends that, pursuant to Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27, his office can "only exercise [] its authority to review an appointing authority's selection of candidates when the authority selects a person with a lower score than another candidate on the list . . ." and "in this case [the Police Department] selected among candidates who had . . . all ranked equally on the eligibility list." Def. Mem. at 11. Despite Hartnett's contention, however, section 27 is *not* triggered by the selection of "a person with a lower score than another candidate." *Id.* (emphasis added). Rather, the statute authorizes Hartnett to review an appointing authority's rationale when it selects somebody "other than the qualified person whose name appears *highest*."[9] Mass. Gen. Laws ch.

---

[7] *See, e.g.*, N. J. Stat. Ann. § 40A:14-9.6 (West 1999) ("[A] resident shall be appointed rather than a nonresident thereof in any instance in which the resident and nonresident achieved the same final average score in such test . . . ."); Albuquerque, N.M., Personnel R. and Regs. R. 231 ("When two or more applicants have the same final score, preference shall be given according to seniority, if no other order of preference has been specified.").

[8] In addition to the lack of statutory guidance, the Massachusetts courts have yet to consider whether Hartnett has the ability or responsibility to examine promotional selections among equally-scored candidates.

[9] Hartnett's reliance on the "lower score" language likely stems from the manner in which the Personnel Administration Rules

31, § 27 (emphasis added). This subtle difference illustrates that section 27 presupposes that there will only be one person for an appointing authority to select, i.e., the highest scoring candidate. Any selection among equally-scoring candidates is therefore a "bypass" because all of their names "appear highest." Accordingly, the appointment of less than an entire group of equally-scoring candidates triggers section 27: i.e., it would appear that the appointing authority must immediately file with Hartnett a written statement of reasons for not appointing the entire group (even if there are not enough openings for all of them). *See id.* Such justifications are subject to Hartnett's review. *See MacHenry*, 40 Mass. App. Ct. at 635.[10]

---

define a "bypass." *See* Personnel Administration Rules PAR.02 ("Bypass, the selection of a person or persons whose name or names, by reason of score . . . appear lower on a certification than a person or persons . . . whose names appear higher on said certification.") However, "to the extent that there is a conflict between a statute and a regulation, the statute must prevail over the administrative regulation." *Veksler v. Board of Registration in Dentistry*, 429 Mass. 650, 652, 711 N.E.2d 562 (1999), quoting *Pinecrest Village, Inc. v. MacMillan*, 425 Mass. 70, 73, 679 N.E.2d 216 (1997).

[10] It must be remembered that the Court is here ruling on a motion to dismiss Hartnett and takes the White Officers' complaint at face value. The litigants' motion papers do not present, and the Court's independent research has not uncovered, any long-standing tie-breaking administrative procedure of either the Division or the Boston Police Department that comports with the civil service law. Should either defendant come forward with such an administrator procedure, support the description with admissible evidence, and demonstrate that the procedure was followed in this

B. *Hartnett's General Obligations Under Civil Service Law*

Even though the Court is confident that section 27 imposes a specific duty upon Hartnett to intervene whenever there is a selection among equally-scoring candidates, Hartnett's more general obligations under the civil service law reveal an additional duty to act in the case at bar. First, under Massachusetts law, Hartnett is required to "evaluate the qualifications of applicants for civil service positions in accordance with *basic merit principles* and . . . to administer, enforce, and comply with the civil service law and rules. *MacHenry*, 40 Mass. App. Ct. at 635 (emphasis added); *accord* Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 5(a), (c) (1999). Among other things, the term "basic merit principles" means (i) "advancing . . . employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge and skills . . .;" (ii) "assuring fair treatment of all applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration without regard to . . . race [or] color . . . .;" and (iii) "assuring that all employees are . . . protected from arbitrary and capricious action." Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 1 (1999). Since the allegations illustrate that Hartnett was aware -- and disapproved -- of the Police Department's intent to promote the Black Officers on the basis of race, his failure to require the Police Department to justify the eventual promotion of the Black Officers to the exclusion of the equally-scoring White Officers does not comport with basic merit principles. Hartnett failed to assure "fair treatment . . . without regard to race" and protect the White Officers from "arbitrary and capricious action."

---

case, the Court necessarily will give such administrative procedure appropriate deference.

Second, Hartnett has the authority "to approve or disapprove specifications and qualifications *submitted* by an appointing authority . . . for any civil service position . . . and, in the case of any disapproval, to establish such specifications and qualifications when, in his opinion, the appointing authority has failed to furnish *satisfactory* specifications and qualifications . . . ." *Id.* § 5(c) (emphasis added). Even if section 27 did not require the Police Department to "submit" its reasons for promoting the Black Officers over the equally-scoring White Officers, the Police Department essentially made such submissions in the course of detailing its race-based reasons for promoting the Black Officers over the higher-scoring "white" candidates. Under the basic merit principles, such justifications are hardly "satisfactory" and Hartnett was required to disapprove and establish satisfactory qualifications and specifications.

Third, Hartnett has the authority "to evaluate the qualifications of applicants for civil service positions. "*Id.* § 5(d). This broad grant of discretion, which might not normally require evaluation of a promotional selection among equally-scoring candidates, is triggered when -- as is the case here -- Hartnett knows that race is the primary qualification of a selected applicant. In light of these three general statutory obligations, Hartnett's attempt simply to shrug off his authority to prevent what is alleged to be a known and admittedly race-based appointment policy -- one that is clearly violative of basic merit principles -- is unacceptable.

V. CONCLUSION

At the most, in the absence of any valid tie-breaking administrative procedure, Hartnett is always required to treat

any decision to promote less than an entire group of equally-scoring candidates as a bypass under section 27 and subsequently to reject the use of race as a "reason for appointing the person whose name was not highest." *Id.* § 27. At the least, in the case at bar, Hartnett was required to (i) reject submitted qualifications that are unsatisfactory, even if the submission of such qualifications was not required, and (ii) evaluate promotional selections when he knows that such selections do not comport with basic merit principles. *See id.* § 5(c), (d). In either event, the alleged facts reveal that Hartnett possessed and violated a duty to protect the White Officers from "unfair treatment" and "arbitrary and capricious action." *Id.* § 1. Since section 1983 authorizes liability on the basis of omissions, *see Maldonado-Denis v. Castillo-Rodriguez*, 23 F.3d 576, 581 (1st Cir. 1994), and Hartnett was authorized to prevent the alleged deprivation of the White Officer's constitutional rights by the Police Department, this Court DENIES Hartnett's motion to dismiss. [Docket No. 14].

/s/ _____
WILLIAM G. YOUNG
CHIEF JUDGE

(2)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 23 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 02-1850

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

THE CITY OF BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, DENNIS A. WHITE, AND HAROLD WHITE,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS, MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, DENNIS A. WHITE, AND HAROLD WHITE, IN OPPOSITION

Jonathan M. Albano
Rheba Rutkowski
Counsel of Record
Bingham McCutchen LLP
150 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 951-8000

Attorneys for Respondents Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers, Dennis A. White, and Harold White

36 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Whether the petition should be denied where there was no genuine dispute of material fact concerning a public employer's decision to consider race in choosing among candidates for promotion to police sergeant with the same certification scores; where the First Circuit Court of Appeals correctly applied the governing law in affirming the district court's judgment that a public employer's race-conscious decision was justified by a compelling governmental interest and narrowly tailored to serve that interest; and where the First Circuit's decision does not conflict with the decision of any other circuit court of appeals.

Whether the petition should be denied where the First Circuit Court of Appeals correctly applied the governing law in determining that the petitioners lacked standing to pursue claims for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 where this decision raises no conflict among the circuit courts of appeal and where the petitioners had no meritorious claims, even if they did have standing.

Whether the petition should be denied where no issue of state law was presented to or ruled upon by the First Circuit Court of Appeals and where there is no other basis for review by this Court of any issues of state law.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers is a corporation that has no parent corporation and is not owned in whole or in part by any publicly held company.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented For Review ii

Corporate Disclosure Statement iii

Table of Contents iv

Tables of Authorities v

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 1

Provisions at Issue 2

Statement of the Case 3

A. Prior Proceedings 3

B. Factual Background 5

1. The History Of Race Discrimination Within The Boston Police Department 5

a. The MAAAP Consent Decree 5

b. Implementation of the Decree 7

c. The 1991 Amendment to the Decree 7

d. MAMLEO's challenge to the 1992 Exams 8

e. The promotion of Rafael Ruiz 10

f. The First Circuit's review of the Ruiz promotion 12

2. The Promotions At Issue In This Case 12

Reasons For Denying The Writ 15

Conclusion 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

Page

Adarand Const., Inc. v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1995) 16

Adarand Const., Inc. v. Slater, 228 F.3d 1147 (10th Cir. 2000), *cert. dismissed as improvidently granted sub nom Adarand Const., Inc. v. Mineta*, 534 U.S. 103 (2001) 20

Boston Police Superior Officers Fed'n v. City of Boston, 147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998) ..... *passim*

Castro v. Beecher, 334 F. Supp. 930 (D. Mass. 1971), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 459 F.2d 725 (1st Cir. 1972) 5, 6

Castro v. Beecher, 365 F. Supp. 655 (D. Mass. 1973) 22

Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. v. Denver, 36 F.3d 1513 (10th Cir. 1994) 21

Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pennsylvania v. Philadelphia, 6 F.3d 990 (3d Cir. 1993) 21

Coral Const. Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991) 21

Cotter v. City of Boston, 73 F. Supp. 2d 62 (D. Mass. 1999) 4

Cotter v. MAMLEO, 219 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1072 (2001) 4

EEOC v. Federal Labor Relations Auth., 476 U.S. 19 (1986) 22

Davis v. United States, 417 U.S. 333 (1974) 24

Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1004 (1998) 21

Ensley Branch, NAACP v. Seibels, 31 F.3d 1548 (11th Cir. 1994) 24

Fournier v. Reardon, 160 F.3d 754 (1st Cir. 1998) 26

Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989) 26

Grutter v. Bollinger, --- U.S. ---, 123 S. Ct. 2325 (2003) 16

Harrison & Burrowes Bridge Const., Inc. v. Cuomo, 981 F.2d 50 (2d Cir. 1992) 21

Kennon v. Slipstreamer, Inc., 794 F.2d 1067 (5th Cir. 1986) 26

Kosak v. United States, 465 U.S. 848 (1984) 23

Local No. 93, Int'l. Assn. of Firefighters v. City of Cleveland, 478 U.S. 501 (1986) 16

Mackin v. City of Boston, 969 F.2d 1273 (1st Cir. 1992) 18, 19

Majeske v. City of Chicago, 218 F.3d 816 (7th Cir. 2000) 18

Massachusetts Ass'n. of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dept., 780 F.2d 5 (1st Cir. 1985) 6

Massachusetts Ass'n. of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dept., 973 F.2d 18 (1st Cir. 1992) 6

McNamara v. City of Chicago, 138 F.3d 1219 (7th Cir. 1998) 19

Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693 (1976) 26

Quinn v. City of Boston, 325 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2003) 23

Schurr v. Resorts Int'l Hotel, Inc., 196 F.3d 486 (3d Cir. 1999) 20

Shaw v. Hunt, 517 U.S. 899 (1996) 20

Soto v. Flores, 103 F.3d 1056 (1st Cir. 1997) 26

Stuart v. Roache, 951 F.2d 446 (1st Cir. 1991) ..... *passim*

Texas v. Lesage, 528 U.S. 18 (1999) 24, 25

United States v. Paradise, 480 U.S. 149 (1987) 19

Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ., 476 U.S. 267 (1986) 16, 17, 24

DOCKETED CASES

Massachusetts Ass'n. of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dept., No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. 1980) 5, 6, 22

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

United States Constitution, Art.III 2

United States Constitution, Amdt. XIV 2

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND RULES

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 1

28 U.S.C. § 1343(3) 26

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... *passim*

29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D) 7, 11, 12

29 C.F.R. § 1607.5(B) 8

Equal Opportunity Employment Commission's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 29 C.F.R §§ 1607.1-1601.18 7

Fed. R. Evid. 408 26

Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31 ..... 2, 14, 26

No. 02-1850

In the Supreme Court of the United States

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

v.

THE CITY OF BOSTON, ET AL.,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENTS, MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, DENNIS A. WHITE, AND HAROLD WHITE, IN OPPOSITION

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals is reported at 323 F.3d 160 (1st Cir. 2003) and is reproduced at Petitioners' Appendix ("Pet. App.") 5a-30a. The opinion of the district court is reported at 193 F. Supp. 2d 323 (D. Mass. 2002), and is reproduced at Pet. App. 31a-98a.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the First Circuit Court of Appeals was entered on March 25, 2003. The First Circuit denied a petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing en banc on May 28, 2003. The petitioners invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

PROVISIONS AT ISSUE

Section One of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section Two of Article III of the United States Constitution, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority.

42 U.S.C. § 1983, which provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State . . . subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress . . . .[1/]

[1/]As discussed below, no issue arising under Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31 is properly before this Court.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

There is no basis for further review by this Court. The First Circuit Court of Appeals correctly applied to the undisputed facts – including unrebutted expert testimony – this Court's long-standing principles of strict scrutiny in ruling that a decision of the Boston Police Department to promote three African-American police officers to the rank of sergeant was narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest. This decision does not conflict with any decision of another court of appeals.

In a non-dispositive ruling, the First Circuit also correctly applied the governing law in determining that the petitioners lacked standing to pursue claims for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This decision also does not conflict with any decision of another court of appeals. Moreover, the First Circuit determined the merits of the petitioners' claims after finding that the petitioners had standing to seek immediate promotion.

The petitioners' complaint asserts no state law claims; nor were any issues of state law presented to or ruled upon by the First Circuit. Furthermore, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 does not provide a cause of action for alleged violations of state law. Accordingly, no issues that may arise under state law are properly before this Court.

In view of the foregoing, the petition for writ of certiorari should be denied.

A. Prior Proceedings

The petitioners seek review of a judgment of the First Circuit Court of Appeals, affirming in part and reversing in part an order of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, holding that the promotions of three African-American police officers by the Boston Police Department

("BPD") were lawful and not in violation of the United States Constitution.

The initial complaint named as defendants the BPD, BPD Commissioner Paul F. Evans; BPD Director of Human Resources Edward P. Callahan, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Executive Office for Administration and Finance, Human Resources Division ("HRD"). The complaint was later amended to name only two defendants, the City of Boston (the "City") and James J. Hartnett, Jr., in his official capacity as HRD Personnel Administrator ("Hartnett").

On October 20, 1999, the district court denied a motion to dismiss filed by Hartnett. *See Cotter v. City of Boston*, 73 F. Supp. 2d 62 (D. Mass. 1999). Thereafter, the First Circuit reversed the district court's denial of a motion to intervene as party defendants filed by respondents Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers and BPD Sergeants Dennis A. White and Harold White (collectively, "MAMLEO"). *See Cotter v. MAMLEO*, 219 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1072 (2001).

On January 14, 2002, the district court dismissed Hartnett from the case after Hartnett agreed to settle with the petitioners. *See* Pet. App. at 99a-100a. As part of the settlement, Hartnett and the petitioners stipulated to certain alleged facts, which they sought to have entered as an order of the court. *Id.* The City and MAMLEO contested many of the stipulations, none of which constitutes an established fact. The district court refused to enter the stipulations as an order of the court. *Id.* at 100a.

After discovery -- as well as a *Daubert* hearing, at which the district court accepted MAMLEO's expert, Dr. Kathleen Lundquist -- the parties filed cross motions for summary judgment. On March 22, 2002, the district court granted summary judgment for the City and MAMLEO and denied plaintiffs' cross-motion for summary judgment. *See* Pet. App.

96a-98a. On March 25, 2003, the First Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's order granting summary judgment for the City and MAMLEO, *see* Pet. App. at 24a, but reversed the district court's determination that the petitioners had standing to pursue a claim for damages, as well as the district court's decision to retain jurisdiction over subsequent hiring and promotional decisions by the BPD, *id.* at 27a.

On April 21, 2003, the petitioners filed a Petition for Rehearing En Banc, which the First Circuit denied as untimely on May 28, 2003. *See* Pet. App. 1a-2a. On June 19, 2003, the petitioners filed the instant petition for writ of certiorari.

B. Factual Background

1. The History Of Race Discrimination Within The Boston Police Department

The history of race discrimination within the BPD is well documented in the consent decree entered in *Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dep't*, No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. 1980) (the "MAAAP Consent Decree"), as well as in a number of court cases (and filings submitted therein), beginning with *Castro v. Beecher*, 459 F.2d 725 (1st Cir. 1972), in which the First Circuit affirmed a district court's finding that the BPD discriminated against African-American applicants through the use of entry-level testing procedures that favored Caucasian candidates. *See Boston Police Superior Officers Fed'n v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13, 20 (1st Cir. 1998).

a. The MAAAP Consent Decree

In 1978, the Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police ("MAAAP"), MAMLEO's predecessor-in-interest, sued the BPD for race discrimination against minority police officers in its promotional practices. The suit was settled on September 16, 1980 by the district court's entry of the

MAAAP Consent Decree, the parties to which were the BPD, the Massachusetts Department of Personnel Administration ("DPA," now HRD), MAAAP, and certain public employees and officials. *Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dep't*, No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. 1980). *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15.

Since the MAAAP Consent Decree was entered, the First Circuit has, on four occasions, considered challenges to the Decree's legality and to certain promotion practices undertaken pursuant to or consistent with its terms. *See Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dep't*, 780 F.2d 5 (1st Cir. 1985) (rejecting Superior Officers' motion to intervene to attack the Decree); *Stuart v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446 (1st Cir. 1991) (rejecting reverse-discrimination challenge to the Decree); *Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dep't*, 973 F.2d 18 (1st Cir. 1992) (dismissing challenge to the 1991 amendment to the Decree); *Boston Police Superior Officers Fed'n v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998) (rejecting reverse-discrimination challenge to race-conscious promotion, holding that, while the Decree did not apply to the challenged promotion, the promotion nonetheless constituted lawful affirmative action). These decisions, along with the filings submitted therein, establish the following undisputed facts.

The plaintiff class certified by the MAAAP Consent Decree comprised "[a]ll present and future black sworn officers in the [BPD]." *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15. As of March 2, 1978, when the MAAAP action was commenced, there was only one (.45%) black sergeant among the 222 BPD sergeants. *Id.*; *Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 448. The parties to the Decree traced the small number of eligible black applicants for BPD supervisory positions to entry-level testing practices that had been found to violate Title VII in *Castro v. Beecher*, 334 F. Supp. 930 (D. Mass. 1971), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 459 F.2d 725 (1st Cir. 1972). *See Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 452.

One principal element of relief contained in the Decree was the requirement that BPD promotional exams be validated in accordance with the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 29 C.F.R. §§ 1607.1-1601.18 (the "Guidelines"). *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15. The Decree established affirmative-action goals and timetables for promotions to sergeant, the threshold BPD supervisory position. *Id.*

b. Implementation of the Decree

Although the MAAAP Consent Decree contemplated yearly promotions of officers from validated promotional exams, the BPD failed to give any validated exams during the first five years of the Decree, up to and including its scheduled expiration date of September 16, 1985. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15; *Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 448. Between 1985 and 1990, the BPD successfully administered just one validated exam, falling short of the Decree's goals. *Id.*

In 1985, MAAAP successfully sought to have the district court extend the Decree until 1990 and modify the Decree's numerical goals to reflect the increased number of qualified African-American candidates in the BPD. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15. However, by 1990, the BPD had given only one "validated-fair" exam, and the number of blacks promoted still fell short of the Decree's goals. *Id.* As a result, the BPD and MAAAP jointly requested that the court extend the decree until the BPD could give one more "validated-fair" exam in June, 1991. *Id.*

c. The 1991 Amendment to the Decree

Prior to the trial on MAMLEO's claims concerning the 1991 exams, the parties submitted to the district court an Agreement to Amend the Consent Decree ("Amendment"), and requested that it be entered in settlement of MAMLEO's claims. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15-16. The parties also submitted

to the court a separate contract between the parties regarding the design, administration, and validation of the 1992 lieutenants' and captains' exams ("Agreement"), which was intended to obviate the need to resolve judicially the long-standing dispute as to whether the Decree's validation requirements applied to those ranks.

On December 3, 1991, the district court approved the Amendment and explicitly ruled that the Decree's validation requirements applied, not only to promotional exams for the rank of sergeant, but also to exams for promotion to the ranks of lieutenant and captain. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. The First Circuit dismissed the Superior Officers' appeal from this order on ripeness grounds. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. Among other things, the First Circuit noted that the district court's ruling explicitly permitted the Superior Officers to enter an application for a further amendment to the Decree, should the facts so warrant. *Id.* at 21.

d. MAMLEO's challenge to the 1992 Exams

Pursuant to the terms of both the Amendment and the separate Agreement among MAMLEO, the BPD and the DPA, MAMLEO retained a testing expert, Jeffrey W. Daum, Ph.D., to act as liaison for the parties concerning the validity of the 1992 exams. Daum, as well as experts from the BPD and the DPA, jointly developed a civil service exam for the position of lieutenant that was administered in September, 1992. The results of that test, which was "content validated" according to the Guidelines, 29 C.F.R. § 1607.5(B), generated the eligible list from which the BPD made the next round of promotions. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16.

During the course of scoring the 1992 exams, Daum raised an objection to the use of the exam scores as a pure rank order promotion mechanism. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. Reduced to its essentials, MAMLEO's position was that (i) the 1992 exams did not provide a measurement sufficiently refined

as to reflect valid distinctions in the qualifications of candidates who scored within certain ranges of one another on the exams; (ii) it therefore would not be valid under the Guidelines to make promotions in strict rank order of these exam scores; and (iii) such use of these exam scores would produce an adverse impact upon the plaintiff class certified by the Decree. *Id.*

Discussions among the parties concerning the proper method of ranking candidates who passed the 1992 exams continued into 1994. Like MAMLEO, the DPA advised the BPD of the adverse impact upon minority candidates that would result from the use of 1992 exam scores as a pure rank order promotion mechanism. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. In July 1994, the DPA suggested that the BPD use a "banding" scoring system, which would reflect the fact that candidates who scored within a certain range of one another -- there, three points -- had functionally equivalent qualifications. The BPD's initial response to this proposal was negative. On November 18, 1994, Robert C. Dumont, Personnel Administrator, wrote a letter to Commissioner Evans, reiterating the DPA's view that the 1992 exam did not provide a measurement sufficiently precise as to distinguish among the relative qualifications of candidates who scored within three points of one another on the exam.

After MAMLEO learned that the BPD intended to requisition the eligible lists for promotion to the ranks of sergeant, lieutenant, and captain, based upon the results of the 1992 exams, it presented its objection to the use of a pure rank order promotion system to the district court in the form of a Notice of Objection and Request for Scheduling Order or, in the Alternative, Motion for Temporary Restraining Order Pending Evidentiary Hearing ("Notice of Objection"). As stated in the Notice of Objection, MAMLEO's position was that, in order for promotions to be made from the 1992 eligible lists in strict rank order of exam scores, there must be empirical data showing that a higher score is sufficiently distinct, statistically, from a lower score that, as between two candidates who are each qualified for promotion by virtue of having passed the exam, the higher-

scoring individual is likely to perform better on the job than the lower-scoring individual.

MAMLEO thus objected to the use of a pure rank order promotion system as invalid under the Guidelines and likely to produce adverse impact upon minority candidates. It proposed two alternatives to strict rank order promotions: (i) a "sliding band" approach, akin to that described in the DPA's letter to Commissioner Evans; or (ii) the use of limited affirmative action, as permitted by the Decree, to enable promotions to be made without the adverse impact that would result from the use of an invalid ranking system.

In its Notice of Objection, MAMLEO stated its understanding that the BPD and the DPA were willing to continue to discuss means of addressing MAMLEO's objections to pure rank order promotions. It therefore requested that it be permitted either to try its objections immediately or to preserve its objections until after the first round of promotions were made from the 1992 eligible lists. On January 24, 1995, the district court entered an order preserving MAMLEO's objections until after the first round of promotions were made from the 1992 exams.

e. The promotion of Rafael Ruiz

Faced with the DPA's opinion that the 1992 exams did not validly distinguish among candidates who scored within a three-point range, and having been advised that strict rank order promotions would adversely impact minority candidates and, unless independently shown to be valid, would violate the Decree and the Guidelines, the BPD concluded that strict rank order promotions would adversely impact minority candidates. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16.

The BPD expected to make 20 promotions to lieutenant from the 1992 eligible list in the first round. If a pure rank order system had been followed, 18 white officers and two black

officers would have been promoted, with a selection rate for white officers of 20% and a selection rate for black candidates of 12.5%. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. Thus, under a pure rank order system, the selection rate for black officers would have been 62% of the selection rate for white officers, raising a strong inference of adverse impact under the Guidelines. *Id.*; *see* 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D).

On the other hand, the BPD was aware that the DPA and MAMLEO had concluded that the 1992 exams did not validly distinguish among candidates who scored within three points of one another, and that the BPD could promote a third qualified black officer to lieutenant without passing over any individuals whom the test had determined to be more qualified for promotion. Promoting a third black officer also would eliminate the adverse impact that might occur if a pure rank order system were used to make the first round of promotions from the 1992 lieutenants' eligible list. As a result, the BPD accepted the DPA's determination that candidates who scored within three points of one another were equally qualified for promotion.

In February 1995, the BPD promoted 20 officers to lieutenant, three of whom were black. Of the 20 highest-scoring officers, 19 (including two black officers) were promoted in strict rank order of their exam scores, which ranged from 94 to 89. One officer who scored 90 was not promoted for reasons related to his service record. The 20th officer promoted was Rafael Ruiz, a black officer who had scored 88 on the exam. Ruiz was promoted ahead of four white offices, each of whom had scores of 89. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 16. It was undisputed that Commissioner Evans believed at the time that the Decree required the BPD to avoid a promotional decision that would result in an adverse impact under the Guidelines, and that he believed that the inclusion of a third black officer among the twenty new lieutenants was necessary to this end. *Id.* at 17.

Since February 1995, each of the individual plaintiffs in the *Superior Officers* case has been promoted to lieutenant. As

of July 1, 1996, 5 of the 77 lieutenants (5%), and 46 of 269 sergeants (17%) on the force were black. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 17.

f. The First Circuit's review of the Ruiz promotion

In the *Superior Officers* case, the First Circuit affirmed the district court's decision upholding the BPD's promotion of Rafael Ruiz out of strict rank order. The court held that, although the MAAAP Consent Decree had expired in 1995 and did not require that Ruiz be promoted, the promotion was nonetheless lawful because it was narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest. Specifically, the court found that (i) "the BPD's historic discrimination negatively affected the number of black lieutenants at the time of [the challenged] promotion"; (ii) "the BPD's past racial discrimination had manifest effects in the present status of black officers"; (iii) "[t]he effect of prior discrimination was compounded by the fact that experience makes up twenty percent of the score assigned to a candidate for promotion -- a fact that, according to both Defendants' expert and the BPD's personnel director, negatively impacts black (who were on average less experienced) candidates"; and (iv) "[t]he BPD had further justification in 1995 for race-based action in the statistical proof of a violation of the [Guidelines'] four-fifths rule." 147 F.3d at 20-21.[2/]

2. The Promotions At Issue In This Case

On October 19, 1996, the HRD administered a promotional exam for the position of sergeant within the BPD

[2/]The four-fifths rule provides that adverse impact exists if a selection rate for minority candidates is less than four-fifths (80%) of the selection rate for majority candidates. 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D).

("1996 Exam"). In December 1997, the BPD requisitioned 30 sergeants for promotion. The HRD subsequently certified to the BPD a list of 69 candidates who had achieved the highest scores on the 1996 Exam. *See* Pet. App. at 7a.

After the BPD identified 30 officers for promotion, in strict rank order of 1996 Exam scores, the BPD determined that (i) if the promotions were made in strict rank order of 1996 Exam scores, 29 Caucasian officers and one African-American officer would be promoted; (ii) strict rank order promotions would adversely impact African-American candidates, in violation of the EEOC Guidelines four-fifths rule; (iii) in view of this evidence of adverse impact, the BPD might be subject to a lawsuit by African-American candidates if it were to make the 30 promotions in strict rank order of 1996 Exam scores; and (iv) the adverse impact could be mitigated, and compliance with the four-fifths rule achieved, by promoting four African-American candidates within the first 30 promotions. *See id.* at 7a-8a.

Prior to making the promotions at issue, the BPD also was aware that testing experts had determined that the prior 1992 promotional exam had adversely impacted African-American candidates and could not validly distinguish among the qualifications of candidates who scored within a three-point range. In addition, the BPD was aware that testing experts and HRD had recommended the use of "banding" -- i.e., treating as equivalently qualified candidates who scored within a certain range -- as a means of mitigating the adverse impact that would have resulted from making promotions in strict rank order of 1992 Exam scores. *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 24 n.5.

Under the circumstances, the BPD decided to promote the top 27 candidates in strict rank order of 1996 Exam scores (from 92-86) and to promote three African-American officers, Dennis White, Harold White, and James Johnson, who had each scored 84, rather than individuals who had scored 85. *See* Pet. App. at 7a-8a. In so doing, the BPD bypassed five officers who

had scored 85. *See id.* at 8a. No one else, including the petitioners, was affected by the decision to promote Officers White, White, and Johnson.

Because it had selected officers with scores of 84 before officers who had scored 85, the BPD was required by Massachusetts law to provide a statement to the HRD. *See* Mass. Gen. Laws, ch. 31, § 27. On December 26, 1997, the BPD wrote to the HRD, stating its intent to promote three African-American officers who scored 84 on the 1996 Exam ahead of six Caucasian officers with scores of 85. *Cf. Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 24 (noting HRD's determination that, with respect to 1992 promotional exams, candidates who scored within three points of one another were "equally qualified"). The BPD stated that it had selected Officers White, White, and Johnson in order to ensure "compliance with current EEOC guidelines and applicable federal and state discrimination laws." *See* Pet. App. at 9a. *Cf. Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 21 (affirming BPD's determination that promotions in strict rank order would have supported inference of discriminatory impact under EEOC Guidelines).

HRD's Hartnett, believing that the BPD had relied on an expired consent decree in selecting Officers White, White and Johnson out of strict rank order, did not accept the BPD's justification for these promotions. *See* Pet. App. at 9a. Faced with the HRD's position, the BPD promoted all candidates in strict rank order from the highest score through score 85, as well as Officers White, White, and Johnson. *Id.* The petitioners, who also scored 84 on the 1996 Exam, were not promoted to sergeant. *Id.* at 6a.

The persistent effects of past discrimination within the BPD were manifest in 1996, as evidenced by, *inter alia*, a highly significant statistical disparity between African-American and non-African-American sergeants: On October 23, 1996, African-Americans comprised 25.02 percent of the BPD's 1547 officers, but only 16.49 percent of the BPD's sergeants. Pet.

App. at 20a. In order to rectify this discrepancy, the BPD would have to have promoted 20 additional African-Americans, rather than the three officers who were promoted. *Id.* at 23a

The continuing effects of past discrimination within the BPD also are evidenced by statistical proof of adverse impact, in violation of the Guidelines' four-fifths rule, had the BPD made promotions in strict rank order, as the BPD itself had found at the time of the challenged promotions. Pet. App. at 21a. Had the BPD made promotions in strict rank order, the selection ratio for African-American candidates would have been 20% (3%, the African-American selection rate, divided by 15%, the majority selection rate), well below the 80% threshold set by the Guidelines, giving rise to an inference of significant adverse impact. *Id.*

In her expert report, Dr. Kathleen Lundquist concluded that the 1996 Exam adversely impacted African-American test-takers. Pet. App. at 80a-81a. In spite of this adverse impact, the 1996 Exam had not been shown to be content validated under the Guidelines. *Id.* at 79a. Dr. Lundquist, moreover, determined that the selection procedure used by the BPD to make promotions from the 1996 Exam mitigated to the greatest extent possible the adverse impact of the 1996 Exam on African-American candidates for sergeant. *Id.* at 87a.

Since the promotions at issue were made, the BPD has not made any further promotions to sergeant from the 1996 Exam, and all subsequent promotions to sergeant have been made in strict rank order of test scores, except for bypasses for cause. Pet. App. at 42a.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

The petition for writ of certiorari should be denied because, in the decision below, the First Circuit correctly stated and applied the governing law; because there is no conflict between the decision below and the decisions of any other circuit

court of appeals; and because the state-law questions presented for review by the petitioners are not properly before this Court. *See* Supreme Court Rules 10, 11.

1. It is well settled that public employers may constitutionally use race-conscious affirmative action if it is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest. *E.g.*, *Adarand Constr., Inc. v. Pena*, 515 U.S. 200, 237 (1995); *Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.*, 476 U.S. 267, 277-78 (1986).[3/] *See also Grutter v. Bollinger*, — U.S. — , ___, 123 S. Ct. 2325, 2337-38 (2003). The essential inquiry under the compelling interest test is whether the public employer had a "strong basis in evidence for its conclusion that remedial action was necessary." *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277; *Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 449-50. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 20 ("[T]he basic question" in determining whether a compelling government interest exists "is an evidentiary issue: Is there a '*strong basis in evidence*' for the conclusion that the [government action] here at issue serve[d] a remedial purpose with respect to past discrimination."). A public employer has the requisite "firm basis" for believing that remedial action is necessary if there is a statistical disparity between the racial composition of the workforce and the relevant, qualified employment pool. *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 292

[3/]In addition, this Court has "on numerous occasions recognized that Congress intended voluntary compliance to be the preferred means of achieving the objectives of Title VII." *Local No. 93, Int'l Ass'n of Firefighters v. City of Cleveland*, 478 U.S. 501, 515 (1986). "The value of voluntary compliance is doubly important when it is a public employer that acts, both because of the example its voluntary assumption of responsibility sets and because the remediation of governmental discrimination is of unique importance." *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 290 (O'Connor, J., concurring). . "Indeed, [the Court's] recognition of the responsible state actor's competency to take these steps is assumed in [the Court's] recognition of the States' constitutional *duty* to take affirmative steps to eliminate the continuing effects of past unconstitutional discrimination." *Id.* at 291.

(O'Connor, J., concurring); *Stuart*, 951 F.2d at 450-53. "[A] contemporaneous or antecedent finding of past discrimination by a court or other competent body is not a constitutional prerequisite to a public employer's voluntary agreement to an affirmative action plan." *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 289 (O'Connor, J., concurring)

a. The First Circuit correctly held that the undisputed facts demonstrate that the BPD had the requisite "strong basis in evidence" to support the conclusion that race-conscious relief was necessary in order to remedy the present effects of the BPD's past discrimination. Pet. App. at 17a-22a. The court first found that "[t]he [BPD]'s history of discrimination is well-documented by past litigation and records." *Id.* at 18a.

The First Circuit then determined from the undisputed evidence that the BPD "was faced with facts that its efforts at remedying past discrimination had not been successful," and that the effects of the BPD's past discrimination were manifest at the time the challenged promotions were made. Pet. App. at 20a. Specifically, the court found that in "October, 1996 (the latest date before the African-American Officers were promoted for which data is available), African-Americans comprised 25.02% of the BPD's 1,547 officers, but only 16.49% of the BPD's sergeants."[4/] *Id.* The court held that "[t]his difference is statistically significant, and not reasonably attributed to chance.

[4/]Although the petitioners contend that, in making the challenged promotions, the BPD was establishing a "quota" of "16.17%" African-American sergeants, *see* Pet. at 7, the petitioners introduced no evidence of such a quota in the proceedings below. In all events, and as the First Circuit recognized, the undisputed record demonstrates that "there were no quotas or long-term guidelines established, and there is nothing in the [*Superior Officers*] decision requiring affirmative action in future decisions." Pet. App. at 24a.

This disparity is not just a simple assurance of good intention from the City, but concrete evidence that discrimination existed at the time the African-American Officers were promoted." *Id.*

The First Circuit also determined that, "[h]ad the BPD promoted in strict rank order, the selection rate for African-Americans would have been three percent . . . and the selection rate for non-African-Americans would have been fifteen percent . . . , for a selection ratio of twenty percent . . . . This result is well below the eighty percent guideline established by the EEOC." Pet. App. at 7a-8a n.3, 21a. Thus, the court concluded: "In this case, the selection ratio . . . indicat[es] that the City had not yet remedied past discrimination." *Id.* at 21a.

Under the governing law, the undisputed evidence amply demonstrates that the BPD had a "strong basis" for its conclusion that remedial action was warranted. *E.g.*, *Majeske v. City of Chicago*, 218 F.3d 816 (7th Cir. 2000) (upholding constitutionality of race-based promotions based on statistical evidence of past discrimination); *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 22-23 (statistical disparity and judicial findings of past discrimination showed that past discrimination affected the promotion of minority candidates and that the lingering effects of that discrimination were present at the time of the challenged promotion, justifying the BPD's non-rank-order promotion of African-American candidate); *Mackin v. City of Boston*, 969 F.2d 1273, 1277 n.3 (1st Cir. 1992) (even if exam was nondiscriminatory, "the paucity of minority representation in the [BPD] betokened a failure to achieve the central goal of the decree, thus negating any argument that the purposes of the decree had been achieved").

In sum, the First Circuit, in the decision below, correctly applied well-established law to the undisputed facts in determining that the challenged promotions were made to serve a compelling governmental interest. The petitioners fail to offer a cognizable basis for further review of that decision by this Court.

b. Proof that a remedy is narrowly tailored "means, as a practical matter, that it discriminates against whites as little as possible consistent with effective remediation." *McNamara v. City of Chicago*, 138 F.3d 1219, 1222 (7th Cir. 1998). This Court has identified several factors to consider in determining whether race-conscious measures are narrowly tailored, including the necessity for relief; the efficacy of alternative remedies; the flexibility and duration of the relief; the relationship of the numerical goals to the relevant labor market; and the impact of the relief on the rights of third parties. *United States v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 171 (1987). In determining that the promotions challenged in this case were narrowly tailored, the First Circuit correctly applied these well-established principles, as previously elucidated in its decisions in *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 23-25, and *Mackin v. City of Boston*, 969 F.2d at 1278.

The court first concluded that "[o]nly qualified minorities were promoted" and that "they were therefore not 'specially,' or unfairly advantaged by their promotions." Pet. App. at 23a. Next, the court found that, because "[a]ll officers were competing for a limited number of spots . . . , the City's promotion of the African-American Officers did not disturb any legitimate, firmly rooted expectations of the [petitioners]." *Id.* The court further determined that, "[h]ad the City not considered race in the promotions, only thirty promotions would have been made -- twenty-nine Caucasian officers and one African-American officer. As a result of the affirmative action plan, those same twenty-nine Caucasian officers were promoted" and "no additional Caucasian officers would have been [promot]ed." *Id.* at 23a & n.9 (citation omitted).

The First Circuit then found that "[n]o valid policies have been disturbed by [promot]ing three qualified African-American sergeants. While Massachusetts law requires an explanation for promotions made outside of strict rank order, there is no prohibition on such out-of-rank decisions." Pet. App. at 24a (citing Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27).

Finally, the court held that "there were no quotas or long-term guidelines established, and there is nothing in the decision requiring affirmative action in future decisions. The decision is therefore limited in scope and duration." *Id.*

The First Circuit correctly applied the governing law to the undisputed facts in concluding that the challenged promotions were narrowly tailored. The decision below does not conflict with any decision of another circuit court of appeals and does not warrant further review by this Court.

c. To the extent that the petitioners claim error in the First Circuit's strict scrutiny analysis, the arguments fail to demonstrate that further review by this Court is warranted.

i. The petitioners take issue with the First Circuit's consideration of what they claim are impermissible "after the fact" justifications for the challenged promotions. Pet. at 20-27. As a threshold matter, evidence of the invalid nature of promotional examinations is not "after the fact" in the sense alleged by the petitioners. At a minimum, the undisputed facts demonstrate that, prior to making the challenged promotions, the BPD determined that strict rank order promotions from 1996 Exam scores would adversely impact African-American candidates. Pet. App. at 20a.

The petitioners' "after the fact" argument also reads too much into *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996). In contrast to *Shaw*, in which there was "little to suggest that the legislature considered the historical events and social-science data that the reports recount," 517 U.S. at 910, here, the BPD did not act without contemporaneous factual justification. Furthermore, every circuit court that has directly addressed the question of "post-enactment evidence" has held that it is admissible. *See Adarand Constr., Inc. v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147, 1166 & n.11 (10th Cir. 2000), *cert. dismissed as improvidently granted sub nom. Adarand Constr., Inc. v. Mineta*, 534 U.S. 103 (2001); *Schurr v. Resorts Int'l Hotel, Inc.*, 196 F.3d 486, 498 n.12

(3d Cir. 1999); *Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida, Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1004 (1998); *Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. v. Denver*, 36 F.3d 1513 (10th Cir. 1994); *Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pennsylvania v. Philadelphia*, 6 F.3d 990 (3d Cir. 1993); *Harrison & Burrowes Bridge Constr., Inc. v. Cuomo*, 981 F.2d 50 (2d Cir. 1992); *Coral Constr. Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991).

ii. Relatedly, the petitioners argue, as they did unsuccessfully below, that proffering multiple compelling governmental interests puts the BPD "in a constitutionally indefensible position." Pet. 24. This argument fails for numerous reasons.

First, in providing a statement to HRD concerning the challenged promotions, the BPD was (i) acting with respect to the selections of Officers White, White, and Johnson vis-à-vis the candidates from the 85 test category, rather than the candidates from the 84 category and (ii) attempting to comply with a reporting obligation imposed by Massachusetts civil service law, rather than seeking to justify its actions under the United States Constitution. When the BPD learned that the HRD would not accept its justification for promoting Officers White, White, and Johnson before promoting candidates from the 85 test category, it took action that it reasonably believed was lawful without providing further justification to the HRD. That is, in taking action to promote officers from the 85 test category in addition to promoting Officers White, White, and Johnson, thereby promoting 36 candidates in strict rank order of exam scores, the BPD had no reason to believe that any further justification was required as a matter of state or federal law.

Moreover, the fact that the BPD provided a statement to the HRD in order to satisfy a requirement of state civil service law does not mean that the BPD did not act for other reasons as well. *See Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 23. As the First Circuit correctly recognized in the decision below, a "governmental

actor may have several reasons for racially-motivated action; if any legitimate reason satisfies strict scrutiny, the action is constitutional." Pet. App. at 17a n.7.

Furthermore, even if the BPD's justifications for the challenged promotions are limited to those stated in its communications with the HRD, the BPD's effort to ensure compliance with current EEOC Guidelines and applicable federal and state discrimination laws clearly encompasses at least the City's need to remedy its past discrimination and to mitigate the adverse impact against African-American candidates that would have resulted from strict rank order promotions.

iii. The petitioners make the bald assertion, for the first time, that the disparity between the percentage of sergeants who are African Americans (16.49%) and the percentage of police officers who are African Americans (25.02%) "results directly from the implementation of the Consent Decree entered in *Castro v. Beecher* . . . ," *see* Pet. at ii, or the MAAAP Consent Decree discussed above, *see id.* at 5. The petitioners further contend, without developed argument, that this disparity was not "concrete evidence of discrimination." *Id.* at iii, 5.

Contrary to the petitioners' representations, the consent decree entered in *Castro v. Beecher*, 365 F. Supp. 655 (D. Mass. 1973), which governs the BPD's ***hiring*** of patrol officers, is not the same consent decree that was entered in *Massachusetts Ass'n of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Boston Police Dep't*, No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. 1980), which governed the BPD's ***promotions*** of officers to sergeant until its expiration in 1995.

Just how either consent decree could be the root cause of the discrimination that the BPD sought to remedy in making the challenged promotions is unexplained, and, indeed, wholly unsupportable. In all events, because the issue was not litigated below, it provides no basis for further review by this Court. *See EEOC v. Federal Labor Relations Auth.*, 476 U.S. 19, 24 (1986) (noting that this Court ordinarily declines to address issues not

raised in the court of appeals); *Kosak v. United States*, 465 U.S. 848, 850 n.3 (1984) (stating that this Court will not consider arguments not presented to the court of appeals).

iv. The petitioners erroneously suggest that the First Circuit decided the same disparity issue differently in *Quinn v. City of Boston*, 325 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2003). *See* Pet. at ii-iii, 5. In *Quinn*, however, the First Circuit never addressed the question whether a disparity between the number of minorities in entry-level and supervisory positions was evidence of discrimination in making promotions and specifically declined to answer the question whether "unconstitutional hiring practices within the [fire department] have caused a disparate impact on the number of minorities in the higher echelons." 325 F.3d at 34. Instead, the First Circuit merely considered -- in comparing the number of minority firefighters with the number of minorities in the City -- whether the term "firefighters," as used in the consent decree at issue in that case, included all minorities in the fire department or just those in entry-level positions. *Id.* at 29. This is to say nothing of the facts that the promotions challenged in the case at bar were not based upon a consent decree, let alone the same consent decree at issue in the *Quinn* case, and that the BPD's promotions to sergeant were not governed by the one-to-one hiring scheme at issue in *Quinn*.[5/]

The petitioners' spurious claim that the different results reached in these two cases is owed solely to the "luck of the draw," Pet. at 5, provides no basis for granting the petition.

[5/]The consent decree described in *Quinn* governed hiring and recruitment of fire department personnel; was established in 1974; and remained in effect at the time the plaintiffs in that case filed their complaint. *See Quinn*, 325 F.3d at 23-24. As noted above, the MAAAP Consent Decree that formerly governed the promotion of sergeants within the BPD was entered in 1980 and expired by its terms in 1995.

Although they could have filed a timely petition for rehearing en banc to challenge the *Cotter* decision in light of the *Quinn* decision, the petitioners chose not to do so. Pet. App. at 99a-100a. In all events, a conflict between decisions of different panels of the same court of appeals does not warrant certiorari review. *See Davis v. United States*, 417 U.S. 333, 340 (1974).

v. The petitioners' contention that the failure to eliminate adverse impact altogether means that the challenged promotions were not narrowly tailored, *see* Pet. at 21, provides no basis for granting further review. First, the BPD's determination that strict rank order promotions would have adversely impacted African-American candidates is evidence of why the BPD decided to make the challenged promotions. The Constitution does not require proof of the ultimate correctness of the conclusion that remedial action was warranted in order to justify race-conscious affirmative action. *See Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 277; *id.* at 289-91 (O'Connor, J., concurring); *Ensley Branch, NAACP v. Seibels*, 31 F.3d 1548, 1565-66 (11th Cir. 1994) (collecting cases). Nor does Title VII require that an employer eradicate adverse impact completely, and in the event it cannot do so, take no ameliorative action at all. It could not be more plain that such a rule would lead to absurd results, and is wholly antithetical to the Fourteenth Amendment and the purposes and policies of Title VII.

d. The petitioners contend that the First Circuit erred in determining that they did not have standing to pursue a claim for damages against the City. Pet. at 11-16. This argument provides no basis for granting further review because the petition points to no conflict among the courts on this issue, and because the First Circuit correctly stated and applied the governing law in determining that the petitioners did not have standing to pursue a claim for damages.

In *Texas v. Lesage*, 528 U.S. 18 (1999), this Court held that a plaintiff fails to establish the existence of a cognizable injury under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 "where a plaintiff challenges a

discrete government decision as being based on an impermissible criterion and it is undisputed that the government would have made the same decision regardless." 528 U.S. at 21. The First Circuit determined that the petitioners would not have been promoted, even if the BPD had not considered race in making the promotional decisions at issue, and correctly applied this Court's decision in *Lesage* in holding that the petitioners did not have standing to pursue a claim for money damages. *See* Pet. App. at 12a-13a.[6/]

The petitioners attempt to escape *Lesage* by arguing that the First Circuit's conclusion that they had suffered no cognizable injury under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is erroneous because the class sizes of 30 and 36 were "illegal" under state law. Pet. at 11. This argument is based primarily upon stipulations contained in the joint motion of the petitioners and Hartnett for entry of an order for declaratory judgment ("Joint Motion"), which was granted, only in part, by the district court on January 14, 2002. *See* Pet. App. at 99a-100a.

The argument is without merit. First, none of the stipulations recited in the Joint Motion constitutes a litigated, established fact. Indeed, the City and MAMLEO contest the basis for many of the stipulations and opposed the Joint Motion in the district court. Second, the district court specifically denied that portion of the Joint Motion to which the petitioners look for

---

[6/]The petitioners erroneously claim that the district court "found that the Petitioners' *rights had been violated*, and were likely to be violated again because of the use of race in the promotion process," Pet. at 3, and that "the district court affirmed that [they] had standing and *were injured*," *id.* at 10 (emphases supplied). The district court merely found that the petitioners had met the requirements necessary to establish standing. *See* Pet. App. at 53a. The district court, in entering judgment in favor of the defendants-respondents, clearly decided that the petitioners' rights had *not* been violated. *Id.* at 97a-98a.

support. *See* Pet. App. at 100a. Third, the stipulations may not be used against a litigant that is not a party to the settlement. Fed. R. Evid. 408. *See Kennon v. Slipstreamer, Inc.*, 794 F.2d 1067, 1069 (5th Cir. 1986) ("Where the evidence offered favors the settling party and is objected to by a party not involved in the settlement, [Federal Rule of Evidence] 408 *bars the admission of such evidence* . . . ."). Here, the petitioners would offer the stipulations for the sole purpose of proving the City's liability, a wholly impermissible use of such evidence under Rule 408.

The petitioners' complaint, moreover, asserts claims for alleged violations of ***federal*** law, whereas the stipulations contained in the Joint Motion, as well as the proposition cited by plaintiffs from the district court's order on motion to dismiss, are based solely upon a ***state*** statute, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31. The complaint does not even mention Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, let alone assert a claim for relief predicated upon an alleged violation of that statute. Though the petitioners claim that the promotions at issue violate state law, both the First Circuit, *see* Pet. App. 24a, and the district court, *see* Pet. App. at 91a-92a, disagreed.

Even if the complaint had raised a claim for relief under state law, however, such a claim would not allow plaintiffs to recover, as it is well settled that 42 U.S.C. § 1983 does not provide a cause of action for alleged violations of state law. 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3). *See Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 393-94 (1989); *Paul v. Davis*, 424 U.S. 693, 700 (1976); *Fournier v. Reardon*, 160 F.3d 754, 757-58 (1st Cir. 1998); *Soto v. Flores*, 103 F.3d 1056, 1061 (1st Cir. 1997). Thus, the district court's decision on Hartnett's motion to dismiss (which, in any case, is not a decision on the merits) and the stipulations contained in the Joint Motion are irrelevant.

In sum, further review of the decision below is unwarranted because the First Circuit correctly stated and applied the governing law in determining that the petitioners did not have standing to pursue a claim for damages. Moreover,

even if the First Circuit's conclusion as to standing were incorrect, further review by this Court is unnecessary because the First Circuit's decision that the petitioners' constitutional rights have not been violated would be no different, even if the First Circuit had held that the petitioners ***did*** have standing to pursue a claim for damages.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, DENNIS A. WHITE and HAROLD WHITE,

By their attorneys,

Jonathan M. Albano
Rheba Rutkowski
Counsel of Record
Bingham McCutchen LLP
150 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 951-8000

Dated: July 23, 2003

No. 02-1850

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 23 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

WINIFRED N. COTTER; VINCENT J. DIFAZIO; JOHN P. DORIS; WILLIAM J. DWAN; WILLIAM G. KNECHT; PATRICK L. MURPHY; THOMAS L. SEXTON,

Petitioners,

v.

THE CITY OF BOSTON; DENNIS A. WHITE; HAROLD WHITE; MASSACHUSETTS ASSOCIATION OF MINORITY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION FOR RESPONDENT THE CITY OF BOSTON

WILLIAM V. HOCH
Office of the Legal Advisor
Boston Police Department
One Schroeder Plaza
Boston, MA 02120
(617) 343-4550

RORY FITZPATRICK
Counsel of Record
IRENE C. FREIDEL
ANDREW C. GLASS
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
75 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 261-3100

Attorneys for Respondent
The City of Boston

181977

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

A. Whether the Court should deny the petition for writ of certiorari (the "Petition") where the First Circuit's decision that the promotions at issue were a narrowly-tailored means of remedying vestiges of past discrimination at the Boston Police Department does not conflict with the decision of any other court of appeals or of this Court.

B. Whether the Court should deny the Petition where the First Circuit's decision that petitioners lack standing to pursue claims for damages was ancillary to the First Circuit's disposition of the case and does not conflict with the decisions of any other court of appeals or of this Court.

C. Whether the Court should deny the Petition where petitioners never adequately presented to the First Circuit the state law questions raised in their Petition and where those questions do not present a federal question – let alone an important federal question – that merits review by this Court.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	v
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
A. Procedural History	2
B. Factual History	4
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION	7
I. THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DECISION RESTS ON WELL-SETTLED PRINCIPLES OF LAW, WHICH ARE NOT IN DISPUTE ...	7
A. The First Circuit Appropriately Considered Whether The Department Had A Strong Basis In Evidence To Make The Promotions At Issue, And Determined That It Did	8
B. The First Circuit Appropriately Analyzed Whether The Promotions At Issue Were Narrowly Tailored To Meet The Department's Compelling Interest, And Found That They Were	14
C. Petitioners Argue That The First Circuit Misapplied The Law And Made Erroneous Factual Findings; Petitioners Provide No Basis For The Court To Grant Review	16

Contents

Page

1. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit's decision was wrong because the Department purportedly had no contemporaneous evidence of the continuing effects of past discrimination 17

2. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit's decision was wrong because the Department purportedly made no contemporaneous recording of its reasons for making the promotions at issue 19

3. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit ignored an earlier consent decree governing sergeant promotions 20

4. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit improperly permitted the Department to assert several compelling interests for making the promotions at issue 21

5. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit applied the wrong standard of review 21

Contents

Page

II. THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DECISION REGARDING PETITIONERS' STANDING DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH A DECISION OF ANOTHER CIRCUIT OR OF THIS COURT, AND WAS ANCILLARY TO THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DISPOSITION OF THE CASE 22

III. THE COURT SHOULD DECLINE TO REVIEW THE STATE LAW ISSUES THAT PETITIONERS ASSERT ARE RELEVANT TO THE CASE; NONE PRESENTS AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION 25

CONCLUSION 28

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Federal Cases

Abrams v. Johnson,
521 U.S. 74 (1997) 8

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta,
534 U.S. 103 (2001) 9, 18, 26

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater,
228 F.3d 1147 (10th Cir. 2000) 18

Aiken v. Hackett,
281 F.3d 516 (6th Cir. 2002) 22-23

Allen v. Wright,
468 U.S. 737 (1984) 22

Ashton v. City of Memphis,
__ U.S. __, 123 S. Ct. 87 (2002) 23

Boston Children's First v. Boston School Committee,
183 F. Supp. 2d 382 (D. Mass. 2002) 23

Boston Police Superior Officers Federation v. City of Boston,
147 F.3d 13 (1st Cir. 1998) 9, 15, 20

Brockett v. Spokane Arcades, Inc.,
472 U.S. 491 (1985) 26

Builders Association of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook,
123 F. Supp. 2d 1087 (N.D. Ill. 2000) 18

Cited Authorities

Page

Byers v. City of Albuquerque,
150 F.3d 1271 (10th Cir. 1998) 23

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.,
488 U.S. 469 (1989) 8, 14, 19

Coral Construction Co. v. King County,
941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991) 18

Cotter v. Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers,
219 F.3d 31 (1st Cir. 2000) 2, 10

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,
509 U.S. 579 (1993) 9

Davis v. United States,
417 U.S. 333 (1974) 11

Davis v. United States,
405 U.S. 933 (1972) 11

Donahue v. City of Boston,
304 F.3d 110 (1st Cir. 2002) 23

EEOC v. Federal Labor Relations Authority,
476 U.S. 19 (1986) 10, 27

Engineering Contractors Association of Southern Florida, Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County,
122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997) 18

Cited Authorities

Page

Entertainment Research Group, Inc. v. Genesis Creative Group, Inc.,
122 F.3d 1211 (9th Cir. 1997) 27

Fournier v. Reardon,
160 F.3d 754 (1st Cir. 1998) 26

Graham v. Connor,
490 U.S. 386 (1989) 26

Grahek v. City of St. Paul,
84 F.3d 296 (8th Cir. 1996) 23

Grutter v. Bollinger,
__ U.S. __, 123 S. Ct. 2325 (2003) 14

Harrison & Burrows Bridge Constructors, Inc. v. Cuomo,
981 F.2d 50 (2d Cir. 1992) 18

Huddleston v. Dwyer,
322 U.S. 232 (1944) 26

Kosak v. United States,
465 U.S. 848 (1984) 10, 12, 27

Kost v. Kozakiewicz,
1 F.3d 176 (3rd Cir. 1993) 27

Local 28, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association v. EEOC,
478 U.S. 421 (1986) 13

Cited Authorities

Page

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife,
504 U.S. 555 (1992) 22

Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police, Inc., v. Superior Officers Department,
973 F.2d 18 (1st Cir. 1992) 20

Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Superior Officers Department,
780 F.2d 5 (1st Cir. 1985) 20

Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police, Inc. v. Superior Officers Department,
C.A. No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. Sept. 16, 1980)
..... 20

Mackin v. City of Boston,
969 F.2d 1273 (1st Cir. 1992) 15

Majeske v. City of Chicago,
218 F.3d 816 (7th Cir. 2000) 7

McNamara v. City of Chicago,
138 F.3d 1219 (7th Cir. 1998) 14, 15, 23

Miller v. Johnson,
515 U.S. 900 (1995) 7

Northeastern Florida Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America v. Jacksonville,
508 U.S. 656 (1993) 22, 24

O'Sullivan v. Boerckel,
526 U.S. 838 (1999) 28

Cited Authorities

Page

Petit v. City of Chicago,
2001 WL 629306 (N.D. Ill. May 25, 2001) 23

Quinn v. City of Boston,
325 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2003) 10

Rice v. Sioux City Mem'l Park Cemetery,
349 U.S. 70 (1955) 7, 25

Rogers v. Lodge,
458 U.S. 613 (1982) 27

Schurr v. Resorts International Hotel, Inc.,
196 F.3d 486 (3d Cir. 1999) 18

Shaw v. Hunt,
517 U.S. 899 (1996) 8, 17, 18

Sims v. Ware,
1999 WL 637226 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 1999) ... 23

Skinner v. City of Miami,
62 F.3d 344 (11th Cir.1995) 26

Stuart v. Roache,
951 F.2d 446 (1st Cir. 1991) 20

Texas v. Lesage,
528 U.S. 18 (1999) 22, 23, 24

United States v. Paradise,
480 U.S. 149 (1987) 11, 14, 15

Cited Authorities

Page

Virginia v. American Booksellers Association, Inc., 484 U.S. 383 (1988) 25

Wessmann v. Gittens, 160 F.3d 790 (1st Cir. 1998) 11

West Tennessee Chapter of Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. v. Board of Education of the Memphis City Schools, 64 F. Supp. 2d 714 (W.D. Tenn. 1999) 18

Wooden v. Board of Regents of University System of Georgia, 247 F.3d 1262 (11th Cir. 2001) 23, 24

Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education, 476 U.S. 267 (1986) 7, 8, 11

State Case

Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers v. Abban, 434 Mass. 256 (2001) 16

Federal Constitution, Statutes, Regulations, And Rules

U.S. Const. art. III, § 2, cl. 1 22

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... 2, 26

42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 3

Cited Authorities

	Page
Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2)	2
29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D)	5, 12
Supreme Court Rule 10	7, 17
Supreme Court Rule 14.1(a)	28
State Statutes	
Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31	25, 26
Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27	15

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

There is no reason for the Court to grant certiorari in this case. The First Circuit Court of Appeals decided that the Boston Police Department promoted three African-American patrol officers to sergeant to remedy well-documented and persistent effects of its past discrimination and that the Department's remedy was narrowly tailored. Both the District Court and the First Circuit subjected the Department's actions to the strictest scrutiny, and both courts decided correctly that those actions fit squarely within the well-established parameters set forth in the opinions of this Court. The decision below is not in conflict with the decisions of any other circuit or any decisions of this Court. The case below did not present any novel or unsettled questions, and no aspect of the First Circuit's opinion on the merits requires further review.

The Court should reject petitioners' request that it review ancillary issues of standing. The First Circuit's decision that petitioners lacked standing to seek damages is fully in accord with the prior decisions of this Court. Moreover, the First Circuit found that the petitioners did have standing to press their claim for injunctive relief but rejected the claim on the merits. Petitioners were not harmed by the First Circuit's standing decision.

Finally, petitioners provide no basis for the Court to grant a writ in this case to review questions of state law. None of those issues presents a federal question – let alone an important federal question – that merits review by this Court. Moreover, petitioners never brought state law claims in the District Court and never adequately presented any state law questions to the First Circuit for review. Accordingly, no issues derived from state law are properly before the Court.

A. Procedural History

Petitioners are Caucasian officers of the Boston Police Department (the "Department") who sought, but did not obtain, a promotion to the rank of sergeant in 1997. On May 21, 1999, petitioners filed suit against respondent the City of Boston (the "City") alleging that the Department violated petitioners' civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by failing to promote them purportedly on the basis of their race. Petitioners asserted that they were "bypassed" in favor of three African-American officers. Petitioners also sued James J. Hartnett, Jr. ("Hartnett"), in his official capacity as Personnel Administrator of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Human Resources Division ("HRD").[1]

Respondent the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers ("MAMLEO") and two of the African-American sergeants, respondents Dennis A. White and Harold White, whose promotions are at issue here, sought to intervene as of right pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). *See Cotter v. MAMLEO*, 219 F.3d 31, 34-37 (1st Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1072 (2001). Vacating the District Court's denial of their intervention, the First Circuit found that MAMLEO's members had a "substantial" interest in determining "how the Boston Police Department handles, and is allowed to handle, comparable situations [to the instant case] . . . in the future." *Id.* at 37.

On January 14, 2002, the District Court dismissed Hartnett from the action after Hartnett agreed to a settlement of petitioners' claims. *See* App. D to Pet.

---

1. On or about August 17, 1999, Hartnett moved to dismiss petitioners' complaint. The District Court denied Hartnett's motion on October 20, 1999. *See Cotter v. City of Boston*, 73 F. Supp. 2d 62 (D. Mass. 1999) (App. E to Pet., indicating in error that the court's order is dated October 20, 2002).

After full discovery, the City moved for summary judgment, asserting that: (1) the District Court did not have subject matter jurisdiction because appellants lacked standing; and (2) the promotions at issue were a narrowly-tailored means of meeting several compelling government interests, including remedying vestiges of past discrimination in the Department's promotions of minority officers to the rank of sergeant.[2]

On March 22, 2002, the District Court dismissed petitioners' claims and entered judgment in favor of the City and MAMLEO. In its March 21, 2002 Memorandum and Order, the court rejected the City's arguments on standing and operational needs but found that the promotions at issue were a narrowly-tailored means of remedying continuing effects of past discrimination at the Department and avoiding the reasonable likelihood of Title VII[3] litigation. *See Cotter v. City of Boston*, 193 F. Supp. 2d 323, 357 (D. Mass. 2002) (hereinafter, "193 F. Supp. 2d at __") (App. C to Pet.).

Although finding that the promotions at issue did not violate the Constitution, the District Court retained jurisdiction post judgment to oversee all of the Department's future hiring and promotional decisions for sworn (and possibly civilian) employees involving race. *Id.* at 357-58.

On April 8, 2002, petitioners filed an appeal. On April 22, 2002, the City filed a cross-appeal on the issues of petitioners' standing and the District Court's retention of jurisdiction.

---

2. The City also asserted that the promotions were a narrowly-tailored means of meeting the compelling government interests of (1) avoiding the reasonable likelihood of Title VII (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2) litigation if the Department made strict rank order promotions and (2) meeting the Department's operational needs.

3. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2.

On March 25, 2003, the First Circuit entered judgment affirming the District Court's decision that the City's actions did not violate petitioners' constitutional rights and reversing the District Court's retention of jurisdiction over the case. *See* App. B to Pet. In its March 25, 2003 Opinion, the First Circuit ruled that petitioners did not have standing to pursue their claims for damages but had standing to seek injunctive relief granting them immediate promotion. *See Cotter v. City of Boston*, 323 F.3d 160, 166-67 (1st Cir. 2003) (hereinafter, "323 F.3d at __") (App. B to Pet.). The court declined to rule on whether petitioners had standing to seek injunctive relief barring "unlawful discrimination . . . in future promotion contests" involving petitioners. *Id.* at 167-68. Addressing the merits of petitioners' claims, the court ruled that based on the undisputed facts in the record, the promotions at issue were a narrowly-tailored means of remedying vestiges of past discrimination at the Department. *Id.* at 169-72. Finally, the court ruled that "the district court lacked the subject matter jurisdiction to retain jurisdiction over [the Department's] future hiring decisions, and lacked the necessity required to retain jurisdiction over [the Department's] future promotional decisions" and reversed that portion of the District Court's decision. *Id.* at 172-74.

On April 21, 2003, petitioners filed a petition for rehearing en banc. On May 28, 2003, the First Circuit denied the petition as untimely. *See* App. A to Pet. On June 19, 2003, petitioners filed the instant Petition with this Court.

B. Factual History

In 1996, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts administered a sergeant promotional examination pursuant to state civil service laws. The Department thereafter requisitioned 30 sergeants for promotion in December 1997. *See* 323 F.3d at 164. As part of the requisition process, the Commonwealth prepared a list of those officers eligible for promotion based on the results of the 1996 examination.

Using "strict rank order," each of the first 25 officers appearing on the eligibility list (with scores from 92 through 86), except for one officer bypassed for cause, was identified for promotion. Civil service regulations and customary practice provide that the Police Commissioner was then to fill the remaining 5 slots by choosing 5 of the 7 officers who were in the next group on the list with tie scores of 85. *See* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 354.

Once the Department identified the 30 officers for promotion, no others on the list would be reached for promotion in connection with the December 1997 requisition. *See* 323 F.3d at 164. None of the petitioners were identified for promotion because they each received a score of 84 on the promotional exam, and thus were not eligible for promotion under the system of strict rank order promotions.

After the Department identified the original 30 officers for promotion, the Department developed concerns that the promotions would have a negative effect on the Department from both a legal and operational perspective: Had the Department made the original 30 promotions in strict rank order, it would have promoted 29 white officers and one African-American officer. *Id.* The Department determined that such a result would violate the so-called "four-fifths rule" in the EEOC's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D), which indicates adverse impact against minority candidates. *Id.*

For this and other reasons discussed below, the Department decided to promote 27 candidates – 26 white officers and one African-American officer, who had scores ranging from 92 (the highest score) down to 85 – in strict rank order (bypassing one person for cause) and to promote three additional African-American officers, Dennis A. White, Harold White, and John Johnson, who scored 84. *See* 323 F.3d at 164-65.

The decision to promote Officers White, White, and Johnson from among the candidates with scores of 84 was made only *after* the decision that those receiving 84 and lower would not be promoted and after the original list of those to be promoted revealed that adverse impact would result.

In promoting 27 candidates in strict rank order, and then promoting Officers White, White, and Johnson, the Department bypassed 5 officers scoring 85. But for the promotion of Officers White, White, and Johnson, 3 out of those 5 would have received a promotion. No one else, including petitioners, was affected by the decision to promote Officers White, White, and Johnson.

After the Commonwealth objected to the decision to bypass the officers with scores of 85, the Department became concerned that the promotions of Officers White, White, and Johnson might be in jeopardy. *See* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 332. Rather than demote them, the Police Commissioner decided to promote 6 additional officers (one formerly bypassed for cause and all 5 who scored 85).[4] *See* 323 F.3d at 165.

Since the promotions at issue were made, the Department has not relied on the 1996 examination to promote any other individuals to the rank of sergeant. Another promotions examination was administered in 1998, and all promotions to sergeant since those at issue have proceeded in strict rank order, except for bypasses for cause. *See* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 332.

---

4. Petitioners misspeak when they assert that "HRD permitted the promotions [at issue] provided that the City of Boston promote all candidates down to and including the score of 84, but excluding all white candidates at score 84." Pet. at 3. HRD's permission did not turn on the Department's "excluding" the "white candidates" who scored 84. Rather, HRD simply found that the Department's promotion of 36 patrol officers – including all candidates scoring 85 and above plus Officers White, White, and Johnson who scored 84 – to be acceptable. *See* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 332.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

Petitioners ask the Court to review the First Circuit's application of well-settled principles of strict scrutiny to the undisputed record of this case. The Petition, however, is based entirely on petitioners' claim that the First Circuit made erroneous factual findings and misapplied the law. The Petition sets forth no conflict between the decision of the First Circuit and the decision of any other court of appeals or of this Court. Nothing in the First Circuit's decision represents a departure from the standard application of garden-variety federal jurisprudence. Moreover, in light of the settled nature of the law, the issues in this case do not carry significant public importance. Rather, the Petition is driven by petitioners' personal interest in this case. *See Rice v. Sioux City Mem'l Park Cemetery*, 349 U.S. 70, 79 (1955) (dismissing certiorari as improvidently granted). The Petition fails to meet the standards for review set forth in Supreme Court Rule 10 and should be denied.

I. THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DECISION RESTS ON WELL-SETTLED PRINCIPLES OF LAW, WHICH ARE NOT IN DISPUTE

It is now incontrovertible that remedying the vestiges of past discrimination is a compelling government interest.[5] Any such remedy, however, is subject to strict scrutiny and must be narrowly tailored to meet its goal. In this case, the First Circuit applied these axiomatic principles to a clear record of facts and expert testimony, none of which were genuinely disputed by

---

5. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 920 (1995) ("[t]here is a significant interest in eradicating the effects of past discrimination" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *see also Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.*, 476 U.S. 267, 285 (1986) (O'Connor, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment); *Majeske v. City of Chicago*, 218 F.3d 816, 819-20 (7th Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1079 (2001) (upholding constitutionality of race-based promotions).

petitioners. The court's decision – that the Department's promotion of three African-American officers was constitutional – is consistent with the jurisprudence of the other courts of appeal and of this Court as well as with the prior decisions of the First Circuit. Accordingly, the Petition should be denied.

A. The First Circuit Appropriately Considered Whether The Department Had A Strong Basis In Evidence To Make The Promotions At Issue, And Determined That It Did

In establishing the existence of a "compelling interest," the government must demonstrate "a strong basis in evidence for its conclusion that remedial action was necessary." *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469, 500 (1989) (hereinafter, "*Croson*") (quoting *Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.*, 476 U.S. 267, 277 (1986) (plurality op.)); *accord Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 91 (1997); *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899, 908 n.4, 910 (1996). The strong basis in evidence may consist of either "a contemporaneous or antecedent finding of past discrimination by a court or other competent body," *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 289 (O'Connor, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment), or evidence "approaching a *prima facie* case of a constitutional or statutory violation," *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 500.

In this case, the First Circuit did not stray from these principles. It correctly analyzed and determined that a strong basis in evidence existed for the Department's remedial action with respect to its past discrimination. 323 F.3d at 169-72. The court found that a history of past discrimination existed in the Department's promotions of minority officers. *Id.* at 169 ("[t]he Department's history of discrimination is well-documented by past litigation and records"). Specifically, the First Circuit held:

> In 1972, we affirmed a district court's finding that the BPD [(i.e., the Department)] discriminated

> against black applicants through the use of entry-level testing procedures that favored whites. That discrimination resulted in a gross racial disparity among the BPD's ranks.
>
> Nineteen years later we found that racial discrimination in entry-level hiring had adversely affected blacks' representation at the rank of sergeant. 'Remedial action takes time,' we reasoned, 'and discrimination may linger for many years in an organization that had excluded blacks from its ranks.'

323 F.3d at 169 (internal alterations omitted) (quoting *Boston Police Superior Officers Fed'n v. City of Boston*, 147 F.3d 13, 20-23 (1st Cir. 1998) (hereinafter, "*Superior Officers*")).

The First Circuit then considered the City's undisputed evidence that the effects of the Department's past discrimination were still being felt by minorities in the Department at the time the promotions at issue were made, finding that the "Department was faced with facts that its efforts at remedying past discrimination had not been successful." 323 F.3d at 170. The court reviewed the statistical analysis prepared by the City's expert, Professor James Medoff,[6] which demonstrated that at

---

6. Petitioners suggest in passing that the City's expert testimony does not meet the standard "set out by this Court in *Daubert*" – i.e., *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993). Pet. at 28. This argument should be summarily rejected. Despite the opportunity to conduct full discovery, petitioners failed to develop *any* evidence to contradict that which was presented by the City and analyzed by Professor Medoff. *See* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 350. Moreover, because petitioners made only cursory mention of the admissibility of Professor Medoff's analysis in their First Circuit briefing, and give the issue even shorter shrift here, the issue is not properly before this Court. *See Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta*, 534 U.S. 103, 109 (2001) (per curiam) (Cont'd)

the Department, the promotion rate for officers of color to leadership rank – both historically and in 1997 – was significantly lower than the rate for white officers and that the statistical disparity between these promotion rates reflected the continuing effects of past discrimination at the Department.[7]

(Cont'd)
do not decide in the first instance issues not decided below" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *EEOC v. Federal Labor Relations Auth.*, 476 U.S. 19, 24 (1986) (the Supreme Court ordinarily refrains from addressing issues not raised in the court of appeals); *Kosak v. United States*, 465 U.S. 848, 850 n.3 (1984) (an argument not presented to the court of appeals will not be considered by the Supreme Court).

7. Petitioners wrongly imply that in *Quinn v. City of Boston*, 325 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2003), the First Circuit decided the same issue differently. *See* Pet. at 5; *see also id.* at ii-iii. The *Quinn* court, however, never addressed the question of whether a disparity between minorities in entry-level and upper-level positions was evidence of discrimination in making promotions and specifically declined to answer the question of whether "unconstitutional hiring practices within the [fire department] have caused a disparate impact on the number of minorities in the higher echelons." 325 F.3d at 34. Rather, the court's decision was cabined to determining – for the purpose of comparing the numbers of minority firefighters in the department with the numbers of minorities in the city as a whole – whether the term "firefighters" as used in the consent decree at issue encompassed all minorities in the department or only those in entry-level positions. *Id.* at 29. Petitioners also misrepresent that the consent decrees governing hiring and promotions within the Boston Police Department are one and the same. *See* Pet. at ii. That simply has never been the case. Moreover, contrary to petitioners' assertion, the Department's actions here were not based upon a "consent decree," nor were the Department's promotions of patrol officers to the rank of sergeant ever governed by the scheme of one-to-one hiring at issue in *Quinn*.

Of course, if petitioners truly believed that the *Cotter* and *Quinn* decisions were in conflict with each other, they could have filed a timely petition for rehearing en banc to challenge the *Cotter* decision in light
(Cont'd)

Id. ("[a] public employer has the requisite firm basis for believing that remedial action is necessary if there is a statistical disparity between the racial composition of the workforce and the relevant, qualified employment pool") (citing *Wygant*, 476 U.S. at 292 (O'Connor, J., concurring in part and concurring in the judgment)); *accord United States v. Paradise*, 480 U.S. 149, 168 (1987) (plurality op.) ("[d]iscrimination at the entry level necessarily precluded blacks from competing for promotions, and resulted in a departmental hierarchy dominated exclusively by nonminorities")); *Wessmann v. Gittens*, 160 F.3d 790, 803 (1st Cir. 1998) ("[t]he greater the disparity [between the number of qualified minority applicants with those who gain entrance], the stronger the inference that discrimination is the cause of non-entry").

Specifically, the court found that in "October, 1996 (the latest date before the African-American Officers were promoted for which data is available), African-Americans comprised 25.02% of the BPD's 1,547 officers, but only 16.49% of the BPD's sergeants."[8] 323 F.3d at 170. The court held that "[t]his difference is statistically significant, and not reasonably

---

(Cont'd)

of *Quinn*, but petitioners did not. *See* App. A to Pet. More important, a conflict between the decisions of different panels of the same court of appeals is ordinarily not a sufficient basis for granting certiorari. *See Davis v. United States*, 417 U.S. 333, 340 (1974) (noting that in an earlier proceeding, *Davis*, 405 U.S. 933 (1972), certiorari was denied where the solicitor general had noted the conflict was purely internal to the Ninth Circuit).

8. Petitioners assert that in promoting Officers White, White, and Johnson, the Department was establishing a "quota" of having "16.17%" African-American sergeants. *See* Pet. at 7. This assertion should be rejected out of hand. The First Circuit found that the undisputed evidence shows just the opposite, namely that "there were no quotas or long-term guidelines established [by the Department's decision to make the promotions at issue], and there is nothing in the decision requiring affirmative action in future decisions." 323 F.3d at 172.

attributed to chance. This disparity is not just a simple assurance of good intention from the City, but concrete evidence that discrimination existed at the time the African-American Officers were promoted."[9] *Id.*

In addition, the First Circuit reviewed the City's analysis that there would have been an adverse impact against minorities in the Department – within the meaning of the so-called "four-fifths rule" in the EEOC's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, *see* 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D)[10] – had the promotions at issue not been made. 323 F.3d at 164-65, 170. That analysis showed:

> Had the BPD promoted in strict rank order, the selection rate for African-Americans would have been three percent (one African-American officer

---

9. For the first time here, and entirely without elaboration, petitioners argue that that this disparity is not "concrete evidence that discrimination existed" at the time the promotions at issue were made because the disparity purportedly "results directly" from the implementation of either: (1) the consent decree that governs the Department's hiring of patrol officers, Pet. at ii; or (2) the consent decree that until 1995, governed the Department's promotions of patrol officers to the rank of sergeant, Pet. at 4-5. (Contrary to petitioners' assertion, *see* Pet. at ii, 2, the Department's hiring of patrol officers and promotions of them to sergeant were not governed by the same consent decree.) Because these issues were never litigated, they cannot form a basis for granting certiorari. *See Kosc'* 465 U.S. at 850 n.3.

10. The four-fifths rule, 29 C.F.R. § 1607.4(D), provides that:

> [a] selection rate for any race . . . which is less than four-fifths (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact, while a greater than four-fifths rate will generally not be regarded by Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact.

> selected out of thirty-three who passed the examination) and the selection rate for non-African-Americans would have been fifteen percent (twenty-nine promoted out of 192 who passed the examination), for a selection ratio of twenty percent (three percent divided by fifteen percent). This result is well below the eighty percent guideline established by the EEOC.

Id. at 165 & n.3. "While not conclusive evidence of discrimination, this discrepancy in selection rate does serve as a 'benchmark against which . . . to gauge [the City's] efforts to remedy past discrimination.'" *Id.* at 170 (internal alternations in original) (quoting *Local 28, Sheet Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. EEOC*, 478 U.S. 421, 478 (1986) (plurality op.)). "In this case, the selection ratio . . . indicat[es] that the City had not yet remedied past discrimination." 323 F.3d at 170.[11]

Petitioners did not genuinely challenge the factual record proffered by the City. Petitioners offered no expert testimony of their own to rebut the testimony of the City's expert. Applying established law to a record of undisputed facts, the First Circuit decided that the City had a strong basis in evidence to take race-conscious action to remedy the continuing legacy of past

---

11. Petitioners argue that adverse impact could not have been a valid justification for the promotions of Officers White, White, and Johnson because ultimately the Department promoted 36 individuals, and thus in promoting Officers White, White, and Johnson, the Department did not completely eradicate adverse impact pursuant to the EEOC's four-fifths rule. Pet. at 3, 21, 27. This argument is a red-herring, however, because the Department's determination that adverse impact would have been caused by making promotions in strict rank order is evidence of why the Police Commissioner decided to promote Officers White, White, and Johnson. That there was still adverse impact after the promotion of 36 officers is not relevant to the inquiry of whether the Police Commissioner's original motivation was constitutional.

discrimination at the Department. Petitioners have offered no justification for this Court to subject the First Circuit's decision to review.

B. The First Circuit Appropriately Analyzed Whether The Promotions At Issue Were Narrowly Tailored To Meet The Department's Compelling Interest, And Found That They Were

The First Circuit's decision that the promotions at issue were a narrowly-tailored remedy cannot seriously be questioned. Narrow-tailoring analysis "ensures that the means chosen 'fit' [the government's] compelling goal so closely that there is little or no possibility that the motive for the classification was illegitimate racial prejudice or stereotype." *Croson*, 488 U.S. at 493 (plurality op.); *accord Grutter v. Bollinger*, __ U.S. __, 123 S. Ct. 2325, 2341 (2003); *see also Paradise*, 480 U.S. at 171-77 (plurality op.). Applying these principles, the First Circuit determined, on undisputed facts, that the remedial action taken by the City was narrowly tailored, holding:

> The Department would have had to promote twenty African-American officers to create a situation whereby the percentage of African-American officers and African-American sergeants was approximately equal. The necessity for relief was great, but the means chosen by the Department were modest – only three African-American officers were promoted out of rank – indicating narrow tailoring.

See 323 F.3d at 171 (citing *McNamara v. City of Chicago*, 138 F.3d 1219, 1224 (7th Cir.) ("[t]he [narrow tailoring] test is . . . whether the increase is a plausible lower-bound estimate of a shortfall in minority representation among [sergeants] that is due to the [Department's] intentional discrimination in the past"), *cert. denied*, 525 U.S. 981 (1998)).

To reach this conclusion, the court applied the factors set forth in *Mackin v. City of Boston*, 969 F.2d 1273, 1278 (1st Cir. 1992), and *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 23. *See also Paradise*, 480 U.S. at 171 (plurality op.) (listing factors to consider when determining if an affirmative action plan is narrowly tailored). First, the court held that "[o]nly qualified minorities were promoted; they were therefore not 'specially,' or unfairly advantaged by their promotions." 323 F.3d at 171. Officers White, White, and Johnson each received a passing score on the promotional examination, and no candidates with higher scores than Officers White, White, and Johnson were bypassed. Petitioners have never contended that Officers White, White, and Johnson lacked any of the skills or qualifications necessary for their work.

Second, the court found: "All officers were competing for a limited number of spots. Because of this competition, the City's promotion of the African-American Officers did not disturb any legitimate, firmly rooted expectations of the [petitioners]." *Id.* Indeed, "[h]ad the City not considered race in the promotions, only thirty promotions would have been made – twenty-nine Caucasian officers and one African-American officer. As a result of the affirmative action plan, those same twenty-nine Caucasian officers were promoted" and "no additional Caucasian officers would have been hired." *Id.* at 171 & n.9 (citing *McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1222 (defining narrow tailoring as that which "discriminates against whites as little as possible consistent with effective remediation")).

Third, the court determined that "[n]o valid policies have been disturbed by hiring three qualified African-American sergeants. While Massachusetts law requires an explanation for promotions made outside of strict rank order, there is no prohibition on such out-of-rank decisions." 323 F.3d at 171-72 (citing Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31, § 27); *see also* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 354-55 (finding state civil service law provides that tie-score

candidates who are not promoted – such as petitioners here – are not "bypassed" and allows appointing authorities to make decisions based on race) (discussing *MAMLEO v. Abban*, 434 Mass. 256, 261 n.12 (2001)).[12]

Finally, the First Circuit held that in making the promotions at issue, "there were no quotas or long-term guidelines established, and there is nothing in the decision requiring affirmative action in future decisions. The decision is therefore limited in scope and duration." 323 F.3d at 172; *see also* 193 F. Supp. 2d at 352 (the "undisputed evidence suggests that the Department did what was necessary, and no more, to correct the adverse impact of the 1996 exam").

As set forth above, the First Circuit's strict scrutiny of the Department's promotion of three minority officers to the rank of sergeant is unimpeachable. Nothing in its analysis justifies review by this Court.

C. Petitioners Argue That The First Circuit Misapplied The Law And Made Erroneous Factual Findings; Petitioners Provide No Basis For The Court To Grant Review

Petitioners make no argument in support of the Petition that the First Circuit's decision in this case is in conflict with

---

12. Nothing in *Abban* required the First Circuit to find that the use of race in making promotions was barred under state law. The *Abban* court specifically did *not* review the use of race in a situation where, as here, non-minority officers were not promoted because of race-neutral reasons and minority officers with the same score were promoted for reasons that comport with the U.S. Constitution. Moreover, the court held that "[c]ivil service allows for special certifications based on race, color, national origin or sex. [*See*] Personnel Administration Rules, PAR 10. . . . The analysis under 'Par 10' . . . is substantially similar to that of the *strict scrutiny standard* for protected classes under an equal protection claim." *Abban*, 434 Mass. at 261 n.12 (emphasis added).

decisions of other courts of appeal or of this Court, or that review of the First Circuit's decision is necessary to (1) establish uniformity among the courts or (2) address an important public question. *See* Supreme Court Rule 10. Instead, petitioners resort to arguing that the First Circuit made myriad erroneous factual findings and misapplied the law. *Id.* These assertions are baseless, and they provide the Court with no basis to grant review.

1. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit's decision was wrong because the Department purportedly had no contemporaneous evidence of the continuing effects of past discrimination

Petitioners suggest that the Department had no contemporaneous evidence of the continuing effects of past discrimination at the time it made the promotions at issue but instead justified the promotions on incidents that occurred after they were made.[13] Pet. at 23-24. Yet the unrebutted evidence shows that before making the promotions at issue, the Department performed an analysis of the adverse impact promotions made in strict rank order would have on minorities, 323 F.3d at 164, and maintained statistics contrasting the numbers of minority patrol officers versus sergeants in its ranks, *id.* at 170. Given these specific facts and the Department's ongoing awareness of the need "to address racial disparity and bias within its ranks," *id.* at 169, petitioners' claim falls flat.

Moreover, misreading *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899 (1996), petitioners seem to suggest that no evidence developed after the challenged action was taken is admissible. *Shaw*, however,

---

13. Petitioners claim – without any proof – that minority officers' complaints of "racial tensions" and "racial targeting" within the department only occurred after the promotions at issue were made. *See* Pet. at 22-23. But rather, these were ongoing issues at the Department despite its efforts to control them. *See* 323 F.3d at 169-70.

did not hold that evidence, which supports a one-time remedial action, is irrelevant or inadmissible simply because it is not proffered until after the action is taken. Rather *Shaw* limits the use of "post-enactment" justifications only to situations where the government acted without any contemporaneous factual support for its actions. *See id.* at 910 (finding there was "little to suggest that the legislature considered the historical events and social-science data that the [challenged] reports recount"). Furthermore, *Shaw* addresses the sufficiency of expert reports and not the admissibility of "post-enactment" evidence, *id.*, and every court of appeals that has directly addressed the question of whether "post-enactment" evidence is admissible has held in the affirmative. *See Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 228 F.3d 1147, 1166 & n.11 (10th Cir. 2000), *cert. dismissed as improvidently granted sub nom. Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta*, 534 U.S. 103 (2001) (per curiam); *Schurr v. Resorts Int'l Hotel, Inc.*, 196 F.3d 486, 498 n.12 (3d Cir. 1999); *Engineering Contractors Ass'n of So. Fla., Inc. v. Metropolitan Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895, 911-12 (11th Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1004 (1998); *Harrison & Burrows Bridge Constructors, Inc. v. Cuomo*, 981 F.2d 50, 60 (2d Cir. 1992); *Coral Constr. Co. v. King County*, 941 F.2d 910, 920-21 (9th Cir. 1991); *Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago v. County of Cook*, 123 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1093 (N.D. Ill. 2000). *But see West Tennessee Chapter of Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. v. Board of Educ. of the Memphis City Schs.*, 64 F. Supp. 2d 714, 718 (W.D. Tenn. 1999).

Accordingly, because of the strong contemporaneous basis in evidence for the Department's actions, to the extent that the First Circuit relied on "post-enactment" evidence of discrimination at the Department – which petitioners have not established – in ruling in the City's favor, it could properly do so.

2. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit's decision was wrong because the Department purportedly made no contemporaneous recording of its reasons for making the promotions at issue

Petitioners imply – without authority – that a governmental entity must make a contemporaneous recording of its reasons for using a race-based classification. *See* Pet. at 24-27. The Department did exactly that. In a letter submitted to the state Human Resources Division ("HRD") at or around the time of making the promotions, the Department wrote that it was departing from strict rank order to "ensure compliance with current EEOC guidelines, and applicable federal and state discrimination laws." *See* 323 F.3d at 165. The Department had an obligation to attempt to avoid adverse impact under the EEOC guidelines and to remedy the effects of its past discriminatory behavior. *See Croson*, 488 U.S. at 518 (Kennedy, J., concurring) (based on its obligation to provide equal protection of the laws to its citizens, the government has the "absolute duty" to "eradicate racial discrimination and its effects" where those "wrongs were caused" by the government itself). The unavoidable implication of the Department's letter to HRD is that in making the promotions at issue, the Department was acting to discharge those obligations.[14]

---

14. Petitioners state that "the City testified that is was unaware of any federal . . . law which actually required the use of race . . . [and] was unaware of any discrimination against minorities, since [1995]." Pet. at 21. These charges are entirely unfounded. Commissioner Evans' unrebutted testimony that in making the promotions at issue, he desired to avoid adverse impact against minority patrol officers and was cognizant of the Department's history of past discrimination against them, *see* 323 F.3d at 168, reflects that the Department knew it had to comply with EEOC guidelines and its obligation to remedy the continuing effects of past discrimination at the Department – both dictated by federal law. Moreover, the Department's analysis of the adverse impact promotions made in strict rank order would have on minority patrol officers was an indicator of continuing discrimination against those individuals.

3. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit ignored an earlier consent decree governing sergeant promotions

Without elaboration, petitioners imply that because a consent decree governing the promotions of patrol officers to sergeant – i.e., the consent decree entered in *MAAAP*[15] *v. Superior Officers Department*, C.A. No. 78-529-McN (D. Mass. Sept. 16, 1980) (the "MAAAP Decree") – had lapsed in 1995, the Department could not rely on the justification that it was remedying vestiges of its past discrimination in making the promotions at issue. *See* Pet. at ii, 2. This is simply not correct. Nothing in the language or the history of that consent decree evidences that the decree was intended or designed to eradicate all vestiges of past discrimination at the Department but only to provide a framework within which the Department and minorities could work to reduce the disparity between minority patrol officers and sergeants. *See* MAAAP Decree, slip op. at 6 & App. B thereto at 4 (listing as a goal of the decree the need "to prevent the disparity between the percentage of black supervisors and the percentage of blacks eligible for promotion to supervisor from growing"); *accord Stuart v. Roache*, 951 F.2d 446, 448, 451 (1st Cir. 1991); *Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15; *MAAAP v. Superior Officers Dep't*, 973 F.2d 18, 19 (1st Cir. 1992) (per curiam); *MAAAP v. Superior Officers Dep't*, 780 F.2d 5, 6 (1st Cir. 1985). By its terms, the decree was designed so that it would expire five years from its date of entry (subject to a party moving for, and the district court granting, a continuance of the decree) whether or not any of the objectives set forth in the decree had been achieved. *See* MAAAP Decree, slip op. at 7; *accord Superior Officers*, 147 F.3d at 15-17. That the decree ultimately expired simply means that no party sought an extension. The decree's expiration does not establish – as petitioners imply – that all vestiges of

15. The term "MAAAP" refers to the Massachusetts Association of Afro-American Police, Inc., the predecessor of MAMLEO.

past discrimination in sergeant promotions had been remedied by that point in time or that the parties or district court conceded as much. Nor did the decree's expiration preclude the parties from taking further steps to attempt to eradicate remaining vestiges of past discrimination.

4. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit improperly permitted the Department to assert several compelling interests for making the promotions at issue

Petitioners assert that the First Circuit misapplied the law by not analyzing each reason proffered by the Department for its use of race to determine if each was a "compelling interest." *See* Pet. at 27-29. The government, however, is not precluded from asserting alternative "compelling interests." Rather, a "governmental actor may have several reasons for racially-motivated action; if any legitimate reason satisfies strict scrutiny, the action is constitutional." 323 F.3d at 168 n.7.

5. Petitioners argue that the First Circuit applied the wrong standard of review

Contrary to petitioners' assertion, *see* Pet. at i, 24-25, the First Circuit did not substitute a "plausibility standard" for strict scrutiny review. In the course of reviewing the City's unrebutted testimony regarding the Department's contemporaneous reasons for making the promotions at issue, the First Circuit stated "[i]t is plausible that the Department did not feel the need to identify the multiple factors influencing its decision" at the time it made the promotions. 323 F.3d at 168. The court was simply acknowledging, however, that as long as a governmental entity has a strong basis in evidence when it uses a race-based classification, there is no requirement that the government announce to the world all the reasons it has for its action. Accordingly, petitioners' assertion should be rejected.

Petitioners' various assertions that the First Circuit erred by affirming the grant of summary judgment to the City – on the ground that the City had no valid reason for making the promotions at issue – provide no justification for issuance of a writ of certiorari.

II. THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DECISION REGARDING PETITIONERS' STANDING DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH A DECISION OF ANOTHER CIRCUIT OR OF THIS COURT, AND WAS ANCILLARY TO THE FIRST CIRCUIT'S DISPOSITION OF THE CASE

As with its application of strict scrutiny, the First Circuit's application of the law to the evidentiary record pertinent to petitioners' standing was straightforward and routine. Petitioners have pointed to no conflict among the courts on this issue, because there is none. Rather, the First Circuit applied core principles of standing under the U.S. Constitution to an undisputed factual record and determined that petitioners lacked standing to seek damages.

To establish Article III standing, a plaintiff must show that: (1) he has suffered an "injury-in-fact;" (2) there is a causal connection, not too attenuated, between the asserted injury-in-fact and the challenged actions; and (3) it is likely rather than speculative that "the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision." *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992); *accord Northeastern Fla. Chapter, Associated Gen. Contractors of Am. v. Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. 656, 664 (1993) (hereinafter, "*Jacksonville*"); *see also Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 751-52 (1984). In addition, to have standing to seek damages based on discrete governmental actions, a defendant may "defeat liability by demonstrating that it would have made the same decision absent the [race-based] consideration," thus showing that the plaintiff was not injured. *See Texas v. Lesage*, 528 U.S. 18, 20-21 (1999) (per curiam); *accord Aiken v. Hackett*,

281 F.3d 516, 519 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied sub nom. Ashton v. City of Memphis*, __ U.S. __, 123 S. Ct. 87 (2002); *Donahue v. City of Boston*, 304 F.3d 110, 116 (1st Cir. 2002); *Wooden v. Board of Regents of Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 247 F.3d 1262, 1277 (11th Cir. 2001); *Byers v. City of Albuquerque*, 150 F.3d 1271, 1274-75 (10th Cir. 1998); *McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1221; *Grahek v. City of St. Paul*, 84 F.3d 296, 297-98 (8th Cir. 1996).[16]

The First Circuit looked to these fundamental principles in determining that petitioners lacked standing to pursue their claims for damages. 323 F.3d at 166-67. The court held that petitioners could not establish the touchstone of standing, namely, that they suffered injury as a result of the complained of action. *See id.* at 166 (citing *Lesage*, 528 U.S. at 21). Specifically, the court ruled that "[i]t is uncontested that had the Department not used race-conscious criteria, it would have only promoted candidates with a score of eighty-five or higher. Because appellants only scored eighty-four, they cannot show standing for damages."[17] 323 F.3d at 166; *see also Aiken*, 281 F.3d at 520; *McNamara*, 138 F.3d at 1221; *Grahek*, 84 F.3d at 297-98.

Moreover, contrary to petitioners' assertion, *see* Pet. at 14, the First Circuit's analysis does not contradict the Eleventh Circuit's reasoning in *Wooden*, 247 F.3d at 1283, that a plaintiff has not been injured for standing purposes where he was

---

16. *See also Petit v. City of Chicago*, 2001 WL 629306, at *5 (N.D. Ill. May 25, 2001); *Boston Children's First v. Boston Sch. Comm.*, 183 F. Supp. 2d 382, 393 (D. Mass. 2002); *Sims v. Ware*, 1999 WL 637226, at *3 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 1999).

17. Because petitioners could not show they had suffered an injury-in-fact, the First Circuit had no need to reach the question of whether petitioners had shown the requisite causal connection between the asserted injury-in-fact and the challenged actions or whether it was likely rather than speculative that the injury would be redressed by a favorable decision.

eliminated from consideration for selection by a race-neutral first step. Here, the Department applied such a race-neutral first step in identifying for promotion the thirty sergeants it needed through the process of strict rank ordering, all of whom scored 85 or above.[18] *See* 323 F.3d at 164. Once the Department identified the thirty officers for promotion, no others – including petitioners, all of whom scored 84 – were eligible for promotion under the system of strict rank order promotions. *See id.* It was only *after* the Department identified the original thirty officers for promotion that the Department developed concerns that the promotions – which included only one minority officer – would have a negative impact on minorities and undertook to use a race-based classification to correct that impact. *See id.* Petitioners have failed to offer any basis for the Court to grant a writ based on the First Circuit's interpretation of governing standing law.

Petitioners also incorrectly assert that the First Circuit should have applied *Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. 656, and not *Lesage* in determining whether petitioners had standing to pursue claims for damages. *See* Pet. at 14-15. As the Eleventh Circuit held in *Wooden*, however *Lesage* is plainly relevant to the standing inquiry for damages because it defines the relevant injury that a plaintiff must establish to seek damages. 247 F.3d at 1277. By contrast, *Jacksonville*'s "equal footing" analysis applies to prospective injunctive relief "when the government erects a barrier" as part of a "set-aside program." *Id.* at 1276 (citing *Jacksonville*, 508 U.S. at 666). Here, the promotions at issue constituted a single event designed to address the Department's concerns regarding the results of the 1996 examination and were not part of an on-going government set-aside program.

---

18. Petitioners' accusation that the class size of thirty sergeants was "illegal" is without foundation. *See* Pet. 11. Petitioners have never rebutted the Department's evidence that (1) it needed only thirty sergeants and (2) identified thirty candidates – which never included petitioners – through the process of strict rank ordering before ever considering whether to use race in making the promotions.

Moreover, the court's standing analysis was ancillary to the ultimate disposition of the case: Because the court found that petitioners had standing to seek immediate promotion, it thus gave petitioners' claims a full and fair review on their merits. On this basis alone, the Court should decline review of the case.[19] *See Rice v. Sioux City Mem'l Park Cemetery*, 349 U.S. 70, 79 (1955) (the Supreme Court avoids questions that do not present an issue "of immediate public significance" but are "of importance merely to the litigants") (dismissing certiorari as improvidently granted).

III. THE COURT SHOULD DECLINE TO REVIEW THE STATE LAW ISSUES THAT PETITIONERS ASSERT ARE RELEVANT TO THE CASE; NONE PRESENTS AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION

Petitioners posit that the Court should take review of this case to decide whether Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31 – the state civil service statute – bars the Department from considering race in making promotions. For a number of reasons, however, petitioners are not entitled to air the issue before this Court.

A dispute over whether a court of appeals correctly applied state law ordinarily does not merit certiorari review, but rather this Court typically defers to the lower court's application of state law. *See Virginia v. American Booksellers Ass'n, Inc.*, 484 U.S. 383, 395 (1988) (the Supreme Court "rarely reviews a

---

19. In addressing the issue of standing, petitioners misspeak when they assert that the District Court "found that the Petitioners' *rights had been violated*, and were likely to be violated again because of the use of race in the promotion process." Pet. at 3 (emphasis added); *see id.* at 10. Rather, the District Court found only that petitioners had met the injury-in-fact, and other requirements, necessary to establish standing. 193 F. Supp. 2d at 334. The court, of course, entered judgment in favor of the City as to all of petitioners' claims, thus deciding that petitioners' rights had *not* been violated. *Id.* at 357.

construction of state law agreed upon by the two lower federal courts"); *Brockett v. Spokane Arcades, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 491, 499-500 (1985). This is especially so when the state law at issue has no bearing on an important federal question. *See Huddleston v. Dwyer*, 322 U.S. 232, 237 (1944). The Court's deference reflects its belief that the district and appellate courts are more familiar with, and thus can interpret more efficiently, the laws of the state in which they sit. *See Brockett*, 472 U.S. at 499-500. Petitioners' assertion that the First Circuit failed to apply state law – specifically Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 31 – in deciding whether the City's actions were justified under the U.S. Constitution is the very type of dispute in which this Court typically avoids becoming enmeshed. The issue simply does not present a federal question – let alone an important federal question – and thus does not merit review by this Court.

Furthermore, because petitioners never brought any state-law claims against the City[20] and never adequately presented any state-law questions to the First Circuit (spending little more than a page addressing the issue out of a total of 91 pages of briefing that petitioners presented to the First Circuit), none of those issues are properly before this Court. *See Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Mineta*, 534 U.S. 103, 109 (2001) (per curiam) ("[w]e ordinarily do not decide in the first instance

---

20. Petitioners cannot bootstrap their claim that the City violated state law to their Section 1983 claim. "Section 1983 'is not itself a source of substantive rights,' but merely provides 'a method for vindicating *federal rights* elsewhere conferred.'" *Fournier v. Reardon*, 160 F.3d 754, 756 (1st Cir. 1998) (emphasis added) (quoting *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 393-94 (1989)). Section 1983 does not provide a cause of action for alleged violations of state law where no right secured by federal law has been violated. *See Fournier*, 160 F.3d at 757-58 (citing *Skinner v. City of Miami*, 62 F.3d 344, 347 (11th Cir.1995)); *see, e.g., Fournier*, 160 F.3d at 756-58 ("whether Massachusetts law was violated or the department failed to follow its own disciplinary procedures matters little" for Section 1983 purposes, where plaintiff failed to establish that any of his federal rights were violated).

issues not decided below" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *EEOC v. Federal Labor Relations Auth.*, 476 U.S. 19, 24 (1986) (the Supreme Court ordinarily refrains from addressing issues not raised in the court of appeals); *Kosak v. United States*, 465 U.S. 848, 850 n.3 (1984) (an argument not presented to the court of appeals will not be considered by the Supreme Court); *Entertainment Research Group, Inc. v. Genesis Creative Group, Inc.*, 122 F.3d 1211, 1217 (9th Cir. 1997) ("a bare assertion does not preserve a claim, particularly when . . . a host of other issues are presented for review"); *Kost v. Kozakiewicz*, 1 F.3d 176, 182 (3rd Cir. 1993) ("casual mention of an issue in a brief is cursory treatment insufficient to preserve the issue on appeal"); *see, e.g., Rogers v. Lodge*, 458 U.S. 613, 628 n.10 (1982) (declining to address federal statutory issue not properly raised in court of appeals).

CONCLUSION

That the Petition presents eight unfocused questions for review is proof by itself that petitioners cannot identify a single issue worthy of review on certiorari. *See* Supreme Court Rule 14.1(a); *see also O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 858 (1999) (Stevens, J., dissenting) ("[t]he most helpful and persuasive petitions for certiorari to this Court usually present only one or two issues, and spend a considerable amount of time explaining why those questions of law have sweeping importance and have divided or confused other courts"). Because the remainder of the Petition does no better job in identifying any extraordinary circumstances that would merit certiorari review in this Court, the Petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM V. HOCH
Office of the Legal Advisor
Boston Police Department
One Schroeder Plaza
Boston, MA 02120
(617) 343-4550

RORY FITZPATRICK
Counsel of Record
IRENE C. FREIDEL
ANDREW C. GLASS
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP
75 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 261-3100

Attorneys for Respondent
The City of Boston

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 18 2003
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(4)

No. 02-1850

In the Supreme Court of the United States

WINIFRED N. COTTER, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

THE CITY OF BOSTON, ET AL.,
Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM
Under The Provisions of Supreme Court Rules 15.8, 18.10 and 25.5

MICHAEL C. MCLAUGHLIN
Counsel of Record

LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL C. MCLAUGHLIN
ONE BEACON STREET
33RD FLOOR
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108
(617) 227-2275

Counsel for Petitioners

September 2003

BECKER GALLAGHER LEGAL PUBLISHING, INC.,
CINCINNATI, OHIO 800-890-5001

10 pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents i

Table of Authorities ii

New Issue Resulting from a recent United States District Court Decision Related to the Instant Case 1

Conclusion 7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Adarand v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1995) 5, 6

Bush v. Vera, 116 S. Ct. 1941 (1996) 5

Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448 (1980) 5

Valimore Williams v. City of Boston,
civil action number 00-11082-NG 1

NEW ISSUE RESULTING FROM A RECENT UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DECISION RELATED TO THE INSTANT CASE

On September 9, 2003 the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts dismissed the case of *Valimore Williams v. City of Boston*, civil action number 00-11082-NG as to all defendants. The mere allegations in the *Williams* complaint were inappropriately and unconstitutionally relied on by the First Circuit Court of Appeals in the instant case as justification, at least in part, for the use of race by the City of Boston against the Petitioners, even though the *Williams* case had not been adjudicated. Obviously, any reliance on the mere allegations contained in the *Williams* case must be deemed unconstitutional as it applies to the instant case.

The Petition for Cert. outlines the fact that the *Williams* case could never have been relied on by the governmental actors as a compelling governmental reason for using race against the Petitioners, because the allegations in the *Williams* case arose seventeen (17) months after race was used against the Petitioners by the City of Boston. In addition, it was the First Circuit Court of Appeals itself that proffered the allegations in the *Williams* case as a "compelling governmental interest," even though it was not pled by the City of Boston as the reason that race was used against the Petitioners.

The Petitioners have raised in the Petition for Cert. the constitutionality of the First Circuit substituting the allegations in the *Williams* case as its own "compelling governmental interest" in place of the governmental interests alleged by the City of Boston. The Petitioners have challenged the retroactive justification of the use of race against the Petitioners by relying on an alleged "racial incident" in the

Williams case that occurred seventeen months after race was used against the Petitioners.

The First Circuit relied on the *Williams* case, not by name, but by allegations when it stated:

> "Commissioner Evans, who made the decision to promote the African American officers, was aware of racial tensions within the Department. Officers had complained to him about disparate treatment, including racially based punishment and job assignment. Officers also complained to him that they were racially targeted following an incident where a noose was placed on an officer's motorcycle."

See Opinion, First Circuit Court of Appeals, p. 21a of Petition for Certiorari.

The "noose incident" referred to in the above quote is the *Williams* case. However, at the time that the First Circuit unfortunately relied on the *Williams* allegations, *Williams* had not been adjudicated in District Court. Indeed, the Petitioners themselves were unaware that the *Williams* case was pending before the United States District Court until after the First Circuit's decision.

On September 9, 2003 the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts dismissed the *Williams* case and determined that the alleged incident ("the noose incident") in the *Williams* case:

> "most certainly did not rise to the level of seriousness or pervasiveness required to establish a 'hostile environment' or deprivation of constitutional rights. Moreover, Williams failed to adduce any evidence,

other than his own speculative assumptions, that any difficulties he may have faced on the job resulted from racial animus.

For the foregoing reasons, the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is allowed and the case is dismissed in its entirety."

As a result of all of the above, it is now clear that the First Circuit undertook a highly unusual and improper procedure of:

1. Commenting on the *Williams* case which had been filed in United States District Court but had not been adjudicated. One can only speculate on why a circuit court would elect to comment on a matter below that had not proceeded through trial or any appeal process. Such comment suggests a troubling break from procedure, protocol, and fundamental violations of the Petitioners' Substantive and Procedural Due Process rights. Indeed, the raising by the Court of Appeals of the mere allegations in an unrelated case below and the retroactive application to the Petitioners' case strikes at the essence of Due Process, where the Petitioners were never given any opportunity to take discovery on the "mere allegations," much less dispute the application of such mere allegations to the instant case;

2. Relying on the mere allegations of the *Williams* case without the City of Boston ever pleading that it used race against the Petitioners because of the *Williams* allegations;

3. Relying on the mere allegations of the *Williams* case as if the allegations were findings of fact. The First Circuit simply assumed allegations by a plaintiff in an unrelated case to be true and substituted that "motion to dismiss standard" in the *Williams* case for the Strict Scrutiny standard required in the instant case;

4. Retroactively applying the mere allegations in the *Williams* case to the instant case to justify the use of race against the Petitioners, even though the use of race against the Petitioners occurred seventeen (17) months earlier;

5. Inexplicably relying on the mere allegations in the *Williams* case as true for the purpose of establishing a compelling governmental interest on behalf of the City of Boston, while at the same time, disregarding the fact that the City of Boston, in the *Williams* case, had denied the allegations and in fact asserted that the allegations had no basis in reality whatsoever. Thus, the First Circuit must have elected to disbelieve the City's position in *Williams* while at the same time unilaterally pretending that the City believed the "noose incident" was racial for the purposes of the instant case; and

6. Upon being informed in the Petition for Rehearing En Banc that the City of Boston had argued before the United States District Court in the *Williams* case that there were no racial components to the "noose incident," the First Circuit nevertheless allowed its decision to stand.

The District Court found that there was no racial animus involved in the *Williams* case. As such, therefore, the First Circuit could never have relied on the incident and should not have attempted to conclude that the *Williams* allegations could have been justification for the use of race in the instant case.

Fundamentally, it appears that the First Circuit panel went out of its way to "construct" any justification it could for the use of race by the governmental actor, in violation of this Court's admonishment that courts must remain "most skeptical" about the motivations of a governmental actor when race is being employed to the detriment of a citizen. *See Bush v. Vera*, 116 S. Court 1941, 1951-56 (1996). Here, the First Circuit not only has abandoned its "most skeptical" posture, it has actively involved itself in advocating for and substituting of alternative compelling governmental interests as if the First Circuit were the governmental actor in question. Racial classifications are simply too pernicious to permit anything but the "most exact connection between the justification and the classification." *Adarand v. Pena*, 115 US 200, 213 (1995) quoting Stevens, J. dissenting in *Fullilove v. Klutznick*, 448 US 448 (1980). Since the First Circuit has substituted its justification, and now said justification has been adjudicated to be without basis, then the First Circuit, having actively involved itself in the advocacy of the position, can do nothing to now demonstrate any "connection between the classification and the justification," much less the "most exact connection."

Given the First Circuit's (a) substitution of its own justifications; (b) the retroactive application of such justifications; (c) the reliance on the mere allegations in the *Williams* case as if they were findings of fact; (d) commenting on a case below that had not yet been adjudicated; and (e) relying on mere allegations in a case below that had not yet

been adjudicated, one can hardly doubt that the requirements of Strict Scrutiny, as outlined by this Court, were entirely abandoned by the First Circuit in a procedure which is both inappropriate and inexplicable. Moreover, the First Circuit's decision with regard to the *Williams* case is symptomatic of its various other holdings in the instant case. Its decision denying the Petitioners Article III standing, its use of the so-called "plausibility" standard as applied to Strict Scrutiny, ex post facto justifications for the use of race, its total disregard of narrow tailoring, and perhaps most importantly, the disregard of the Court of Appeals' and District Court's own involvement in the consent decree that established the percentages of minorities while holding that the percentage of minority sergeants itself was "concrete evidence of discrimination," all demonstrate a complete disregard of Strict Scrutiny.

Virtually every aspect of the First Circuit's decision indicates that there is no "most exact connection between the justification and the classification," *see Adarand*. There is no possible narrow tailoring even remotely associated with the proffered justifications of the City of Boston or of the substituted, retroactive justifications of the First Circuit Court of Appeals by relying on the *Williams* allegations. Indeed, it cannot be denied that the City of Boston could never have narrowly tailored its use of race against the Petitioners to achieve the so-called compelling governmental interest of rectifying the "racial noose incident" in the *Williams* case, even if the *Williams* case had occurred prior to the use of race against the Petitioners (which it most certainly did not). Neither the City of Boston nor the First Circuit can narrowly tailor a remedy to rectify the effects of an alleged racial incident which the District Court has now determined never happened.

CONCLUSION

The First Circuit has so clearly and utterly abandoned Strict Scrutiny, its intentions, and design, so as to require the finding that its holding and decision with regard to the Petitioners must be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Winifred N. Cotter, Vincent J. Difazio,
John P. Doris, William J. Dwan,
William G. Knecht, Michael Locke,
Patrick L. Murphy and Thomas L. Sexton.
By their attorney,
Michael C. McLaughlin
One Beacon Street, 33rd Floor,
Boston, MA 02108

Date: September 18, 2003